

PHILOSOPHY

FROM MONTAIGNE TO FOSDICK

CHAPTER 25 OF PEDANTRY

Montaigne, *Complete Works*
translated by Trachmann (1927)

I WAS often vexed as a boy to see the pedante or pedagogue always held up as the butt or laughing-stock in the Italian comedies, and that the title of Magister was not held in much greater estimation among us. For, having been placed under their charge and tuition, what could I do less than be jealous for their reputation? I tried indeed to excuse them by considering the natural difference that exists between the common sort and those rare men who excel them both in learning and judgement, seeing that their ways lie in entirely opposite directions. But I ^ lost my Latin ' when I saw that it was the finest gentlemen who most despised them; witness our good Du Bellay;

The thing I most do hate is learned pedantry.

And that habit of so regarding them goes back to antiquity, for Plutarch tells us that Oreeh and Scholar were terms of reproach and contempt among the Romans.

^ ' Our late abbot used to say that it was a monstrous thing to see a learned monk. Pardieu, my friend, magis magnos etc,' Rabelais's Friar John, a t 3 "pical monk of his time, thus excuses his ignorance.

As I grew older I found that they were most profoundly right, and that magis magnos clericos non sunt magis magnos sapientes} But how it could happen that a mind that is rich with the knowledge of so many things should not become quicker and more wide-aw^ake, and that a coarse and vulgar muid can, without being improved, find room within itself for the words and opinions of the most eminent minds that the world has borne, I am yet in doubt.

To receive so many and so great and powerful brains of others, as a lady {fille], the first of our Princesses,^ said to me, speaking of somebody, his own would have to press and squeeze itself into a smaller compass, to make room for the others.

I should be inclined to say that, just as a plant is drowned by too much moisture and a lamp by too much oil, so is the mind drowned by too much study and matter, for, being occupied and clogged with a great variety of things, it must lose the power of freeing itself, and the weight of them must keep it bent and doubled up. But it is quite otherwise, for our mind expands the more it is filled, and in the examples of the olden time it may be seen, quite to the contrary, that men competent in the management of public affairs, great captains and great councillors in matters of state, have at the same time been very learned.

And as to the Philosophers, holding aloof from aU public occupation, they have indeed also been sometimes despised in the outspoken comedies of their day, since their way of living and their opinions exposed them to ridicule. Would you make them judges of the merits of a lawsuit or of men's actions ? They are quite ready to undertake it. They will besides go into the question, if there be life, if there be motion, if man be other than an ox, what is action and suffering, what kind of beasts law and justice are ? Do they speak of a magistrate, or do they speak with him ? They do so with a disrespectful and discourteous freedom. Do they hear there prince, or a king, praised ? To them he is a shepherd or herdsman, as idle as they, occupied in milking or shearing his beasts, but much more roughly than the shepherd or herdsman. Do you esteem somebody the greater for possessing two thousand acres of land ? They will laugh at the idea, accustomed as they are to embrace the whole world as their possession. Do you boast of your nobility for being able to count up seven rich ancestors ?

^ Perhaps Margaret, wife of King Henry of Navarre, who, though married at the time this was written, was a ' Fiile de Prance \

They will look down on you, as being unable to conceive that all Nature is alike, and that every one of us has had the same number of ancestors, rich, poor, kings, varlets, Greeks, barbarians. And though you were the fiftieth descendant of Hercules, they will think you vain for making so much account of this gift of Fortune. So the vulgar sort despised them, as men ignorant of elementary and ordinary things, as presumptuous and insolent.

But our pedants are far from resembling this Platonic picture. Those were envied as being above the common run, as despising public activities, as having set before themselves a particular and inimitable life, regulated by definite lofty and uncommon ideals. These are despised as being

below the common run, as incapable of public duties, as dragging out a life of mean and base habits in the tail of the vulgar crowd :

*How odious the idle, useless wight.
Whose mouth is stufied with philosophic saws ! (Pacttvixts.)*

As for those philosophers, I say, great as they were in knowledge, they were still greater in every kind of action. And even as they tell of that geometrician of Syracuse, ^ that, having been diverted from his contemplations to put some of the results of them in practice for the defence of his country, he straightway set in motion some terrifying engines of war, with results surpassing all human belief ; himself all the while holding all this handiwork of his in disdain, and thinking he had thereby debased the dignity of his art, of which his works were but the apprenticeship and the pastime ; so they, being sometimes put to the test of action, have been seen to fly with so lofty a wing, that it appeared indeed as if their hearts and souls had become wonderfully enlarged and enriched by the understanding of things.

^ Archimedes, who by bis inventious for three years kept the Romans in check, who were besieging Syxaeuse.

But some of them, seeing the seat of political government in possession of incapable men, have retired within themselves ; and a man who asked Crates how long he should study philosophy, received this answer : ' Till the time when our armies are no longer led by ass-drivers.' Heraclitus resigned the monarch^y to his brother, and to 'the Ephesians who reproved him for spending his time playing with the boys before the temple, he replied : ' Is it not better to do this than to sit at the helm of affairs in your company ? '

Others, with then ideas raised above worldly fortunes, looked upon the seats of justice and even the thrones of kings as base and contemptible. Empedocles went so far as to refuse the royal throne offered him by the people of Agrigentum. Thales, inveighing now and then against the pains that people devoted to getting rich in business, and being met with the retort that he was doing after the manner of the fox, being unable to succeed in it, he had a mind to try the experiment as a pastime ; and, having for the nonce degraded his learning to the service of profit and gain, he set a traffic on foot which within a year brought him so great riches, that the most experienced in that trade were hardly able in all their lifetime to make as much.

What Aristotle relates of certain persons, that they called Thales and Anaxagoras, and their like, wise but not prudent, for not caring sufficiently about more profitable things (besides that I do not quite digest that verbal distinction), that will not excuse my pedantic friends ; and, to see the humble and necessitous fortune wherewith they are content, we should rather have reason to declare them neither wise nor prudent,

I quit this first reason, and prefer to say that the evil proceeds from their taking a wrong view of learning, and that, seeing how we are taught, it is no marvel if neither scholars nor masters show any more intelligence, though they become more learned. In truth, the care and expense which our fathers devote to our education have no other aim but to furnish our heads with knowledge ; of judgement and virtue, not a word I Exclaim to our people, of one who passes by : ' O what a learned man ! ' and of another : ' O what a good man ! ' they will be sure to direct their eyes and their respect to the first. There ought to be a third crier : ' O what blockheads I ' We are apt to inquire : ' Does he know Greek or Latin? Does he write poetry or prose ? ' But whether he is become better or wiser, which is the main thing, that question is left unspoken. We should inquire who knows best, not who knows most. -

We labour but to cram our memory, and leave the understanding and the conscience empty. Even as the birds sometimes fly in search of grain, and bring it in their beaks without tasting it, to feed their young, so do our pedants go picking knowledge out of books, carrying it at the end of their lips, only to spit it out and scatter it to the winds.

It is remarkable how aptly I come in to exemplify this folly. Am I not doing the same thing in the most part of this composition ? I go sniffing about among books, now here now there, for the sentences which please me, not to store them, for I have no storehouse, but to transplant them to this book where, to tell the truth, they are no more mine than they were before. We can, I believe, know only the things that are going on at present, not those of the past any more than those of the future.

But, and this is the worst part of it, their scholars and their little ones are not fed nor nourished by this knowledge ; rather it is passed from hand to hand, to the sole end of making a show of it, to entertain others, and to make up stories of it. It is like a counterfeit coin that has no value in commerce, and is useful only as a counter for casting up.

They have learned to speak with others, not with themselves (Cicero). It is no time for talking, but for steering (Seneca).

Nature, to show that there is nothing barbarous in her conduct of affairs, will often, in nations least cultivated by art, engender productions of the mind that will vie with the most artistic productions. How prettily appropriate to the matter is the Gascon proverb, ' Bouha prou bouha, mas a remuda lovs dits qu'em? We may blow and blow, but when it comes to using the fingers, where are we ? ' taken from a shepherd's song.^

We can say : ^ Cicero said thus ; these are the morals of Plato ; those are the very words of Aristotle ; ' but what do we ourselves say ? what do we judge ? what do we do ? A parrot could say as much.

This manner of regarding knowledge puts me in mind of that wealthy Roman who, with much trouble and at great expense, procured men learned in every branch of knowledge, whom he kept continually around his person, to the end that, when there fell among his friends any occasion to speak of something or other, these scholars might take his place and be quite prepared to supply him, one with a dissertation, another with a line of Homer, and so forth, each according to his trade ; thinking this knowledge to be his own, because it was contained in the brains of men in his employment ; as they also do whose fullness is lodged in their sumptuous libraries.

^ It is coacewable that these words suggested the scene of the 'recorders' in Hamlet. Florio translates them, 'You may blow long enough, but if once you stir your fingers, you may go seek.'

I know one who, when I question him on what he knows, asks me for a book to show it me, and will not venture to tell me that he has an itchy backside without straightway consulting his lexicon to find the meaning of ' itchy ' and of ' backside

We take the opinions and the learning of others into our keeping, and that is all. We should make them our own. We are, properly speaking, like a man who, having need of fire, goes to his neighbour's house to fetch it, and, finding there a fine and large blaze, stops to warm himself and forgets to take any home. What does it avail us to have a paunch full of meat if it be not digested, if it be not transformed within us, if it do not strengthen us and increase our growth ? Do we imagine that Lucullus, who by reading became so great a captain, though without any experience,

set about it after this manner ?

We lean so heavily on others' arms, that our own strength vanishes. Would I arm myself against the fear of death ? I do so at Seneca's expense. Would I extract consolation for myself or another ? I borrow it of Cicero. I might have found it in myself, if I had been trained to do so. I do not like this dependent and mendicant fullness.

Though we may be learned with another's learning, wise, at least, we cannot be but by our own wisdom.

*Him I despise
Who in his own concern is never wise. (Euripides.)*

Whence Ennius : The wise man knows nothing who cannot profit by his wisdom (quoted by Cicero).

*If covetous and vain,
And soft as lambs on fair Euganea's plain, (Juvenal.)*

For wisdom is not only to be acquired, but to be used (Cicero).

Dionysius ^ laughed at those grammarians who anxiously inquire into the sufferings of Ulysses, and know nothing of their own ; musicians who tune their flutes, and do not tune their morals ; orators who study to talk justice, not to do it.

^ Diogenes the Cynic is the person meant.

If our soul go not the better pace, if our judgement be not the sounder, I should wish as dearly that my scholar had spent his time in playing tennis : his body at least would be the more active. See him returning after fifteen or sixteen years employed in study : you can find none so unfit to be put to any occupation. All the progress you discover in him is that his Latin and Greek have made him more proud and conceited than he was before he left home. ^ He should have brought back a full mind, and he only brings a puffed-up one ; instead of enlarging it, he has only Mated it.

These masters, as Plato says of their cousins the Sophists, are, of all men, they who promise to be most useful to mankind, and they alone, of all men, not only do not improve what is committed to their charge, as a carpenter does, or a mason, but make it worse, and demand payment for making it worse.

. If the rule that Protagoras proposed to his pupils were

followed, ' either that they should pay him according to his demand, or swear in the temple how high they estimated the profit they had gained from his teaching, and satisfy him accordingly for his pains my pedagogues would find themselves done, if they stood to the sworn testimony of my experience.

In the patois of my Perigord they very wittily call these wiseacres Lettre[^]ferits, as you might say Lettre-ferus [^] (letter-struck), men whom letters had given, so to say, a hammer-blow. Indeed for the most part they seem to have stepped down even from common sense. For you may see the peasant and the shoemaker go their way simply and naturally, speaking of what they know ; whereas these, trying to strut and swagger with the learning that floats on the surface of their brains, perpetually entangle and trip themselves up. Fine words escape them, but let another fit them. They know Galen indeed, but they know nothing of their patient. They have already filled your ears with laws, yet they have not even understood the crux of the case. They know the theory of all things, but you may seek in vain for one who will put it in practice.

[^] *Ferit* and *feru* were different forms, of the past participle of the obsolete verb *ferir*, Lat, *ferire*, strike.

I have heard a friend of mine, when arguing with one of these gentlemen in my house, invent, by way of a jest, a nonsensical jargon, words without rhyme or reason, a tissue of patchwork, saying that he often interlarded some words having a relation to their dispute, and so keep the blockhead for a whole day debating and all the time thinking that he was answering the objections raised against him ; and yet he was a man of letters and reputation, and wore a fine gown.

Patricians great.

To a blind occiput condeiimed by fate.

Prevent, while yet we may, the rabble's glee,

And tremble at the soofi ye cannot see 1 (Persixts.)

Whoever shall closely observe this kind of people, who are scattered far and wide, will agree with me that for the most part they neither understand others nor themselves, and that, though their memory be full enough, their judgement is completely hollow, except when their nature itself has fashioned it otherwise : as I observed in Adrianus Turnehus, who made no other profession but that of letters, in which he was in my opinion the greatest man that has been seen these thousand years, who had, however, nothing of the

pedant about him but the wearing of his gown, and a certain outward fashion that could not be civilized to courtier ways, which are things of no account. (And I hate your people that will sooner tolerate a soul than a gown that is awry, and will judge a man by his bow, his bearing, and his boots.) For his inmost soul was the most polished on earth. I have often purposely led him, to speak of matters far removed from his profession ; he had an insight so clear, so quick an apprehension, so sound a judgement, that you would have thought that he had never carried on any other profession but the conducting of wars and affairs of state. Those are fine and strong natures, which survive a bad education. Now it is not enough that our education should not spoil us; it must change us for the better.

*Just here and there a heart with hand benign
Prometheus forms, perhaps of clay more fine, (Juvenal.)*

Some of our parliaments, when they have to admit candidates, examine them only on their learning ; others add a test of intelligence, by submitting to them the decision of some law-case. The latter appears to me a better proceeding, and, although both qualifications are necessary, and it is requisite that they should be defective in neither, yet learning is indeed of less value than judgement. The latter may make shift without the former, but not the former without the latter. For, as this Greek line says, of what avail is learning if not attended by understanding ? (Author unknown.) Would to God that, for the good of our justice, these bodies were as well furnished with understanding and conscience as they are with learning ! We learn not for life but for the lecture-room (Seneca). Now it is not enough to tie knowledge to the soul, it should be incorporated with it ; it should not be merely sprinkled, but dyed with it ; and if that does not change it and ameliorate its imperfect state, it is certainly much better to leave it alone. It is a dangerous sword that will hamper and wound its master, if wielded by a feeble hand that knows not how to use it ; so that it were better not to have learned at all (Cicero).

It is perhaps for this reason that neither we nor theology require much learning of women, and that Francis, Duke of Brittany, son of John the Fifth, when they approached him about his marriage with Isabel, a Scottish princess, and added that she had been brought up simply and without any instruction in letters, replied, ^ that he liked her the better for it, and that a woman was learned enough when she knew the difference between her husband's shirt and his doublet

So it is not so great a wonder as they now make of it, that

our ancestors made no great account of learning, and that even to-day it is not found, except by chance, in the chief councils of our kings ; and if the goal, which is the only one we now set up before us, of getting rich by means of law, physic, teaching, and even theology, did not uphold it in credit, you would doubtless see it in as beggarly condition as ever it was. What loss would this be, if they teach us neither to think well, nor to do well ? Now that the learned have become so numerous, good men are wanting (Seneca) . All other knowledge is hurtful to him who has not the knowledge of goodness.

^ ^ Parlement a supreme or sovereign Court or Session of Justice, established in eight capital Cities of France, viz. Paris, Grenoble, Toulouse, Dijon, Rouen, Aix, Rennes and Bordeaux.' Cotgrave's French-English Dictionary, 1632.

" Chrysale, in Moliere's Femmes savantes echoed this opinion ; see Act I, sc. 7.

But the reason that I sought for but now, can it not also proceed from this, that our studies in France having hardly any aim but profit, if we except those men who, by nature born for offices more honourable than lucrative, devote themselves to letters, if at all, only for so short a time (having, before acquiring a taste for them, taken up a profession that has nothing to do with books), there usually remain no others to apply themselves wholly to study but people of mean fortune, who seek their livelihood in it. And the minds of these men being, by nature, by home education, and by example, of the meanest alloy, they bring forth false fruits of knowledge. For knowledge is not capable of giving light to the soul of him that has none, or of making a blind man see : its business is not to furnish him with sight, but to direct it, and to regulate its goings, provided it have feet of its own and straight and capable legs.^

^ A good example of a mixed metaphor.

Knowledge is a good drug, but no drug is strong enough to preserve itself from change and corruption by the taint of the vessel that contains it. Many a man has a clear sight that cannot see straight, and in consequence sees the good and does not follow it, and sees knowledge without making use of it. Plato's principal ordinance in his Republic is to ' give to his citizens their employment according to their nature Nature can do all, and does all. Cripples are ill-adapted for bodily exercises, as are crippled souls for the exercises of the mind ; bastard and vulgar souls are unworthy of philosophy. When we see a man who is badly shod, we say that it is no wonder, if he is a shoemaker. In

like manner experience often seems to show that a physician is worse physicked, a divine less reformed, and [usually] a scholar less competent than any other.

Aristo of Chius had reason to say in olden times that the philosophers did their hearers harm, seeing that most minds are not fit to profit by such instruction which, if not beneficial, is harmful ; the school of Aristigjgus sent forth debauchees, that of Zeno crabbed minds (Cicero).

In that admirable education that Xenophon ascribes to the Persians, we find that they taught their children virtue, as in other nations they teach them letters. Plato says that the eldest son in their royal succession was thus brought up : after his birth he was given into the hands, not of women, but of eunuchs of the highest authority about the kings, by reason of their virtue. On these devolved the charge of rendering him sound and beautiful in body, and after seven years they trained him to ride and hunt. When he arrived at the age of fourteen, they entrusted him to the hands of four, the wisest, the justest, the most temperate, and the most valiant, in the nation. The first taught him religion ; the second, to be always truthful ; the third, to make himsef master of his lusts ; the fourth, to fear nothing.

It is a thing worthy of very great consideration that, in Lycurgus' excellent plan of government, which is indeed a pattern of perfection, though so solicitous about the bringing up of children as its principal concern, and that in the very seat of the Muses, so little mention is made of learning ; whence it appears that those noble youths, disdaining any other yoke but that of virtue, had to be provided, not with masters of science, as with us, but only with masters to teach them valour, wisdom, and justice : an example that Plato followed in his Laws, The manner of their teaching was to put to them questions on the judgement of men and their actions ; if they condemned or praised this person or that deed, they had to reason out their decision ; by this means they sharpened their intellect and at the same time learned what was right. Astyages, in Xenophon's Gyropaedia, asks Cyrus to give an account of his last lesson : ' It is, he says, that in our school a big boy, having a little coat, gave it to one of his comrades who was not so tall, and took from him his bigger coat. Our teacher having made me judge of this dispute, I decided that it was best to leave the matter as it stood, and that each of them seemed to be better suited in that way ; whereupon he pointed out to me that I had done ill, for I had confined myself to considering the fitness where I should in the first place have looked at the justice of the matter, which required that no one should be

forced in regard to what belonged to him.' And he adds that he was whipped for it, as we are in our villages for forgetting the first aorist of tvtttq).

My pedant would have to deliver a fine harangue in genre demonstrativo before he could persuade me that his school is as good as that. They tried the short cut ; and since it is true that the sciences, even when they are directly studied, cannot but teach us wisdom, honesty, and resolution, they tried at the outset to bring their children in touch with results, and to instruct them not by hearsay, but by the test of action, by forming and moulding them, in a living way, not only by words and precepts, but chiefly by examples and works, to the end that their learning might become not merely a knowledge lodged in the mind, but its disposition and habit, not an acquisition but a natural possession. When somebody asked Agesilaus what he thought that children should learn, he replied : ' What they should do being men.' It is no wonder if such an education produced such admirable results.

They used to go, it is said, to the other cities of Greece to find rhetoricians, painters, and musicians, but to Lacedemon for lawgivers, magistrates, and army generals. At Athens they learned to speak well, and here to do well ; there, to disentangle themselves from a sophistical argument and to confound the imposture of words captiously interlaced ; here, to disentangle themselves from the snares and baits of pleasure, and with great courage to frustrate the menaces of fate and death ; those busied themselves about words, these about things ,* there we find a continual exercising of the tongue, here a continual exercising of the soul. Wherefore it is not strange that, when Antipater demanded of them fifty children as hostages, they made answer, quite contrary to what we should do, that they would rather give him twice as many grown men : so much did they value the loss of their country's education ! When Agesilaus invites Xenophon to send his children to be brought up at Sparta, it was not to learn rhetoric and dialectics, but, he says, ' to learn the finest of all sciences, to wit, the science of obeying and commanding

It is very amusing to see Socrates, after his manner, rallying Hippias, who tells him how he earned, especially in certain little townships of Sicily, a good sum of money by teaching, and that at Sparta he earned not a sou ; that they are an idiotic people who can neither measure nor count, that they make no account of grammar and rhythm, wasting their time solely on learning the succession of kings, the foundation and the decay of states, and such trashy tales.

And at the end of all this Socrates, after making him admit, step by step, the excellence of their form of public government, the happiness and virtue of their private life, leaves it to him to guess the conclusion of the futility of his arts.

Examples teach us, both in that martial government and in others of a like kind, that the study of the sciences makes the hearts of men soft and effeminate rather than strong and warlike. The strongest state that we see in the present-day world is that of the Turks, a people equally trained to esteem arms and to despise letters. I find that Rome was more valiant before she became learned. The most warlike nations nowadays are the most rude and ignorant. The Scythians, the Parthians, Tamerlane, may serve as a proof of this. When the Goths ravaged Greece, what saved all the libraries from being committed to the flames was that one of them disseminated the advice that they should leave the enemy in full possession of that kind of furniture, as being proper to divert them from military exercises, and keep them in idle and sedentary occupations. When our King Charles the Eighth, without drawing his sword from the scabbard, saw himself master of the kingdom of Naples and of a good part of Tuscany, the gentlemen of his suite attributed that unexpected facility of conquest to this, that the princes and nobles of Italy spent more time in making themselves learned and clever than vigorous and warlike.

=====

CHAPTER 26 OF THE EDUCATION OF BOYS

Montaigne, translated by Trachmann (1927)

To Madame Diane de Foix, Comtesse de Guise

I NEVER yet knew a father who, though his son were a hunchback and scald-headed, refused to own him ; that is not to say, however, unless he were quite infatuated by his affection, that he would not perceive his defects, but the fact remains that he is his own. So it is with me : I see better than any other that these Essays are but the idle fancies of a man who has nibbled only the upper crust of the sciences in his boyhood, and has retained only a general and formless image of them, a little of each, and nothing thoroughly, after our French manner. For, to sum it up, I know that there is medicine, jurisprudence, four parts of mathematics, and roughly, what these aim at, and perhaps I know besides how much the sciences in general have helped us in our lives ; but as to diving deeper, as to biting my nails

in the study of Aristotle, the monarch of modern science, or stubbornly pursuing some particular branch of knowledge, I have never done it ; nor is there any art of which I could trace even the first lineaments. And there is not a boy of the middle forms who could not claim to be more learned than I, who am not sufficiently equipped to examine him on his first lesson, at least as long as I confined myself to the subject of it. And if I am forced to it, I find myself constrained rather awkwardly to draw upon some matter of universal interest, upon which to test his natural judgement ; a lesson as strange to boys as theirs would be to me.

I have never had regular dealings with any solid book, unless it be Plutarch or Seneca, from whom I draw as did the Danaids, unceasingly filling up and pouring out. Some of it sticks to this paper ; to me, as good as nothing.

History is the game I hunt, or poetry, which I love with a particular affection. For, as Cleanthes said, just as sound, forced through the narrow channel of a trumpet, comes out sharper and stronger, so it seems to me that a thought, concentrated within the harmonious feet of poetry, darts out much more briskly and strikes upon my ear with a more lively resonance. As to the natural faculties which are in me, of which this is the essay, I feel them bending under the burden. My conceptions and my judgements grope their way, staggering, stumbling, and tripping, and when I have gone as far as I can, I am yet by no means satisfied : I still see country beyond, but with a sight so dimmed and foggy, that I cannot clearly distinguish it. And when I attempt to speak indiscriminately of whatever enters my fancy, employing therein only my proper and natural resources, if I happen, as I often do, to light by a happy chance, in the good authors, upon those same subjects that I have attempted to treat, as I have done just now in Plutarch, when he speaks of the power of imagination ; when I see myself, in comparison with those men, so weak and puny, so dull and heavy, I hold myself in pity and contempt.

Yet I flatter myself that my opinions often have the honour to jump with theirs, and that I at least go with them, though a long way behind, saying, ' How true that is ! ' Also that I have this advantage, which is not shared by everybody, that I can recognize the vast difference there is between them and myself. And yet I allow my ideas to run on in the poor and feeble form in which they have been produced, without mending and plastering up the defects that this comparison has laid bare to me.

A man had need of very strong loins to attempt to walk

abreast with those men. Those injudicious vTiters of our century who, amongst their worthless productions, go scattering whole passages from the ancient authors, in order to gain credit, do the very opposite. For the infinitely greater brilliance of the latter makes their own stuff appear so pale, sallow and ugly, that it loses thereby more than it gains.

Here are two contrary fancies : the philosopher Chrysippus mixed into his books, not passages merely, but entire works of other authors, and in one of them the Medea of Euripides ; and Apollodorus said that, if you cut out of them all the foreign matter, there would remain only the blank sheets. Epicurus, on the other hand, in three hundred volumes that he left behind him, did not insert a single quotation from another. ^

^ This paragraph is a marginal interpolation, and breaks the continuity of Montaigne's reflections. The following paragraph should be read in connexion with that preceding the interpolation.

I happened the other day to light upon a passage of the kind : I had been languidly crawling after French words, so fleshless, so bloodless, so void of matter and sense, that they were truly only French words ; at the end of a long and tedious journey I came across a passage that was rich, sublime, and elevated to the very clouds. If I had found the declivity easy and the ascent a little gradual, it would have been excusable : it was a precipice so perpendicular and abrupt that, at the first six words, I knew that I was flying into another world. From thence I descried the quagmire from which I had come, so low and deep, that I never since had the heart to descend to it again. Were I to stuff one of my essays with those rich spoils, it would throw too strong a light on the stupidity of the others.

To reprehend my own faults in others appears to me no more incongruous than to reprehend, as I often do, those of others in myself. They should be everywhere denounced and deprived of every sanctuary. Hence I know how audaciously I myself at every turn attempt to equal myself to my filchings, and to go hand in hand with them, not without a rash hope of deceiving the eyes of judges from discovering them ; but it is as much by the favour of my application as of my invention and power. And besides, I do not compete wholesale with those old champions, and body to body ; I do so by repetitions, by frequent and light attacks. I do not stubbornly grapple with them, but only try their strength, and if I try to keep pace with them, I do so hesitatingly. If I could hold my own with them I should be somebody, for I only attack their steepest points.

As for doing what I have seen others do, covering themselves with another's armour so as not to show so much as a j&nger's end, carrying out their design (an easy thing for a savant in an ordinary subject), in the guise of original ideas of ancient authors pieced together here and there, that would be, as long as they attempt to conceal them and pass them off as their own, in the first place a piece of injustice and meanness, in that, having no capital of their own. where-with to commend themselves, they seek to hide behind a purely borrowed value ; and secondly a great piece of folly, for, if they are satisfied with acquiring by trickery the ignorant approbation of the vulgar, they discredit themselves in the eyes of men of understanding, whose praise alone has any weight and who wrinkle their noses at your borrowed incrustations.

Tor my part I would do anything rather than that. When I quote others I do so in order to express my own ideas more clearly.

This does not apply to those centos which are published as centos,^ and I have iu my time seen some very ingenious ones, among others one published under the name of Capi-lupus, besides the ancients. They show themselves to be men of genius both in these and other works ; as, for example, Lipsius in that learned and laborious compilation, the Politica,

^ A cento was a literary triviality in the form of a poem manufactured by putting together distinct lines or passages of one or several authors, thus producing a new poem with a diHerent meaning. Montaigne seems to have thought more highly of these productions than they deserved.

Be that as it may, (I mean to say), and however good or bad these futilities may be, I have resolved not to hide them under a bushel, just as I should not think of concealing any bald and grizzled portrait of mine in which the painter has depicted, not a perfect face, but my own. For these are my humours and opinions ; I give them as representing what I myself believe, not as what I expect others to beheve. I aim here only at disclosing myself, who may perad venture be a different sell to-morrow, if anything newly learned shall have changed me. I claim no authority, nor do I desire it, to be taken at my word, being too conscious of my lack of instruction to instruct others.

Now somebody said to me the other day in my house, after seeing the preceding article, that I should have enlarged a little on the subject of the education of children.

Well, Madame, if I had any competence on that subject, I could not employ it better than to make a present of it to the little man who threatens shortly to come happy out of you (you are too nobly born to begin otherwise than with a male). For, having had so great a share in the conclusion of your marriage, I have by rights some interest in the greatness and prosperity of all that shall issue from it; besides that the ancient claim that you have on my service sufficiently obliges me to wish all honour, welfare, and advantage to all that you are concerned in. But indeed all that I mean is this, that the most difficult and important branch of human knowledge appears to be that which treats of the rearing and education of children.

In agriculture the operations which 'precede the planting, and the planting itself, are certain and easy ; but as soon as that which is planted comes to life, there are many and difficult ways of cultivating it. So it is with human beings : little industry is needed in the planting, but as soon as they are born, we are charged with a great variety of cares, accompanied by a plenitude of troubles and fears, in training and bringing them up.

The display of their inclinations at that early age is so slight and obscure, the promises are so uncertain and misleading, that it is hard to ground any positive conjecture upon them. Look at Cimon, look at Themistocles and a thousand others, how they belied their promise. The young of bears and dogs show their natural disposition, but men, being very soon influenced by customs, opinions, and laws, easily change or disguise their nature.

And yet it is difficult to force natural propensities. Whence it comes to pass that, by reason of having chosen the wrong path, we often labour in vain and expend much time in training children for a calling to which they cannot settle down. In this difficulty, however, my advice is to guide them ever to the best and most profitable things, and to pay little heed to those uncertain divinations and prognostics which we draw from their childish actions. It seems to me that Plato in his Republic gives too much authority to them.

Madame, knowledge is a great ornament and an instrument of wonderful utility, especially in persons raised to such a degree of fortune as you are. And in truth it is not rightly used in the hands of people of mean and base condition. It takes more pride in lending its aid in the conduct of wars, in the ruling of a nation, in negotiating the friendship of a prince or a foreign people, than in formulating a

dialectical argument, in pleading in an appeal, or in pre-
scribing a box of piUs. Wherefore, Madame, because I
believe that you will not neglect this point in the education
of your children, you who have tasted the sweets of it, and
who come of a lettered race (for we stiU possess the writings
of those ancient Counts of Foix, from whom Monsieur the
Count your husband and yourself are descended ; and
Frangois Monsieur de Candale your uncle every day brings
forth others that will make this quahty in your family
known to many generations to come), I will acquaint you
with one idea of mine on the subject that is at variance with
common usage, and that is all that I am able in this matter
to contribute to your service.

The charge of the governor whom you select for your son,
upon the choice of whom depends the whole success of his
education, will comprise several other important duties, but
I will not touch upon them, being unable to make any
valuable suggestions ; and in this particular matter on
which I presume to give him advice he will take it in so far
as he approves of it. For a child of good family who seeks
learning, not for gain (for so mean an object is unworthy of
the grace and favour of the Muses, and besides, it looks
to and depends on others), and not so much for external
advantages as for his own good, to enrich and furnish himself
within, since you would desire to turn out a man of parts
rather than a scholar, I would have you be careful to choose
as his director one with a well-made rather than a well-
filled head, and to seek one who possesses both, but not so
much learning as character and intelligence ; and he should
exercise his charge after a new method.

The usual way is to keep bawling into the pupil's ears as
one pours water into a funnel, the pupil's business being
merely to repeat what he has been told. I would have the
tutor amend this method, and at the outset, in order to test
the capacity of the mind he has charge of, he should put it
on trial, making his pupil to taste of things, and to discern
and choose them of his own accord, sometimes opening out
the path to him, and sometimes leaving him to open it out
to himseh. I would not have him always to start the sub j ect
and monopolize the speaking, but to listen while the pupil
speaks in his turn. Socrates, and after him Arcesilaus,
first made their disciples speak, and then spoke to them.
The authority of the teachers is generally prejudicial to those
who desire to learn (Cicero).

It is well that he should make him trot before him, to
judge his paces, and see how far he must step down and
adapt himself to his powers. For want of this proportion

we spoil all ; and to be able to choose this and be guided by it in due measure, is one of the hardest tasks I know ; and it is the mark of a lofty and very powerful mind to be able to fall in with the child's gait and to guide it. I walk with a surer and firmer step up hill than down.

When, according to our custom, a teacher undertakes, in one and the same lesson, and with one measure of guidance, to train many minds differing so largely in kind and capacity, it is no wonder if, in a whole multitude of children, he hardly come upon two or three who can reap any real fruit from their teaching.

Let the tutor demand of him an account not only of the words of his lesson, but of their meaning and substance, and let him estimate the profit he has gained, not by the testimony of his memory, but of his life. Let him show what he has just learned from a hundred points of view, and adapt it to as many different subjects, to see if he has yet rightly taken it in and made it his own, taking stock of his progress according to Plato's disciplinary method. It is a sign of crudeness and indigestion to disgorge meat as it has been swallowed. The stomach has not performed its operation, unless it has altered the form and condition of what has been given to it to cook.

Our mind only works on trust, bound and compelled to follow the appetite of another's fancy, a slave and captive to the authority of his teaching. We have been so much subjected to leading-strings, that we no longer have the power of walking freely. Our vigour and liberty are extinct. They never cease to be under guardianship (Seneca).

At Pisa I had a private interview with a worthy man, but such an Aristotelian that the most universal of his dogmas was : ' That the touchstone and measure of all sound opinions and of every truth is conformity to the teaching of Aristotle ; that outside of that there is nothing but chimeras and foolishness ; That he had seen all and said all.' This proposition of his, through having been interpreted a little widely and unjustly, once brought him and for a long time kept him in great danger of the Inquisition at Rome.

We must let him pass everything through a sieve, and store nothing in his head on mere authority and trust. To him Aristotle's principles should be no more principles than those of the Stoics and Epicureans ; let their various theories be put to him, and he will choose, if he is able ; if not, he will remain in doubt. Only fools are certain and cocksure.

For doubting pleases me no less than knowing. (Dante.)

For if he embraces the opinions of Xenophon and Plato by his own reasons, they will be no more theirs : they will be his. He who follows another follows nothing ; he finds nothing, nay, he seeks nothing. We are under no king ; let each one look to himself (Seneca). Let him know that he knows at least. He must imbibe their modes of thought, not learn their precepts. Let him boldly forget, if he likes, whence he has them, but he must be able to appropriate them. Truth and reason are common to every man, and belong no more to him who first gave them utterance than to him who repeats them after him. It is no more according to Plato than according to me, since he and I understand it and see it alike. The bee rifles the flowers here and there, but she afterwards makes honey of what she has gathered, which is all her own : it is no longer thyme or marjoram ; so the things borrowed from others he will transform and blend so as to make a work all his own, to wit, his judgement. His instruction, labour, and study shall have no other aim but the forming of that judgement.

^ Or more probably, perhaps, ' adopting Plato's method of questions and answers in his Dialogues

Let him conceal all whereby he has been aided, and show only what he has made of it. The pillagers, the borrowers, parade their buildings, their purchases, but not what they extract from others. You do not see the spices ^ of the member of Parliament, but you see the alliances he has gained and the honours he has won for his children. None of them renders any public account of his takings, but every one displays his acquisitions.

The profit of our studies lies in our having become the better and wiser for them.

It is, said Epicharmus, the understanding that sees and hears, it is the understanding that turns everything to account, that orders all, that acts, sways, and reigns ; all other things are blind, deaf, and soulless. Truly we make it servile and cowardly by not allowing it the freedom to do anything of itself. Who ever asked his pupil what he thinks of rhetoric and grammar, of such and such a saying of Cicero ? They clap them into our memory ready feathered ^ ; like oracles, where the letters and the syllables are of the substance of the thing. To know by heart is not to know ; it is to retain what has been given in keeping to our memory. What we rightly know we can dispose of, without regard to the pattern, without turning our eyes to the book. What

a poor, paltry competence is a mere bookish competence !
I would have it serve as an ornament, not as a foundation,
according to Plato's opinion, who says : ' Constancy, faith,
sincerity, are the true philosophy ; the other sciences, that
are directed to other ends, are but face-paint.'

^ ' Espices. Spices, or Spice ; also, the fees that be taken by the
(French) Judges, and their assistants, for Bookes perused, Consultations
had, and sentence giuen, in a cause ; (from the auncient manner of
gratefull suitors ; who, hauing preuailed, were woont to present the
Judges, or the Reporters, of their causes, with Comfets, or other Jonkets ;
which gratuitie they afterwards turned into money, and by degrees haue
suffered it to become a dutie, and (as it is at this day) the only, or best,
reuenue belonging to Judiciall places).' — Cotgeauv.

" Like an arrow ; or better perhaps, * with all their feathers like a
fowl thrown unplucked into the cooking-pot.

I should like to have seen Paluel or Pompey, ^ those fine
dancers of our day, teach us to dance caprioles by merely
allowing us to watch them, without making us stir from our
seats, as those men pretend to form our understanding with-
out stirring it up. I should like to see any man teach us to
manage a horse, or a pike, or a lute, or our voice, without
practising them, as these men pretend to teach us to speak
well and form a good judgement, without exercising us in
speaking or forming a judgement. Now, in my apprentice-
ship, whatever we see is sufficient book : a page's mischief,
a varlet's stupidity, conversation at table, these are so many
new matters.

To this end human intercourse is marvellously well
adapted, as well as travel in foreign countries, not after the
manner of our French nobles, merely to report on how many
paces the Santa Rotonda ^ measures, or on the richness of
the Signora Livia's drawers ; or, like some others, how much
longer or broader the face of Nero is in some old ruin of that
city than that on some similar medallion ; but to report
chiefly on the intellectual characteristics and the manners
of those nations, and to rub and file our brains in contact
with those of others. I should wish that he might be taken
abroad in his early childhood, and first, to kill two birds
with one stone, to those neighbouring countries where the
language is least like our own, to which the tongue will not
bend itself unless it be formed in good time.

It is besides a generally accepted opinion that it is not right
to bring up a child in its parents' lap. Their natural love
makes them too soft and tender, even the wisest of them.
They are neither capable of chastising his faults nor of

seeing him reared coarsely as he should be, and hazardously. They could not bear to see him returning, all dust and sweat, from his exercises, drinking hot, drinking cold, or riding a skittish horse, or opposed to a rude antagonist, armed with a foil or any old arquebus. For there is no help for it : if he is to become a man of parts, there is no doubt that we must not spare him in his youth, and must often transgress the rules of physio :

*To live alert at danger's call
Encamped on heath or down. (Hokaoe.)*

^ Ludovico Palvalli and Pompeo Diobono, two eminent Milanese dancing-masters at the court of Henri III.

^ The Pantheon of Agrippa, now used as a church. The Signora Livia was perhaps a ballet-dancer, as a commentator suggests, who adds that these ' caleçons ' were afterwards introduced into France by Mile du Parc of Moliere's company.

It is not enough to stiffen his soul, we must also stiffen his muscles. The soul is too constrained if it be not backed up, and has too hard a task to discharge, alone, two offices. I know how mine groans in partnership with a body so tender, so delicate, and that leans so heavily upon her. And often in my readings I perceive that my masters commend, in their writings, as examples of magnanimity and stoutness of heart, men who are generally remarkable for thickness of skin and hardness of bones.

I have seen men, women, and children so constituted that a cudgelling with a stick is less to them than a fillip to me ; who will stir neither tongue nor eyebrow under the blows. When athletes imitate the philosophers in endurance, it is rather strength of nerves than of heart. Now, to be accustomed to endure labour is to be accustomed to endure pain : labour hardens us against pain (Cicero). He must be broken in to the pain and hardship of exercises, so as to be drilled to the pain and hardship of a dislocation, the colic, cauteries, and imprisonment as well as torture. For he may even be in danger of the two latter, which, seeing the times we live in, threaten both the good and the bad. We are now experiencing this : whoever combats the laws threatens the best of men with the scourge and the halter.

And moreover the governor's authority, which should be paramount over him, is checked and hindered by the presence of the parents ; to which may be added that the respect which the household pays him, and a consciousness of the power and greatness of his house are, in my opinion, no small disadvantages at that age.

In this school of human intercourse I have often remarked this error, that instead of taking stock of other men, we only labour to discover ourselves to them, and are more at pains to retail our wares than to acquire new ones. Silence and modesty are very becoming qualities in social intercourse. Our boy will be trained to save and husband his accomplishments, when he has acquired them ; not to take exception at the stories and foolish things that may be spoken in his presence, for he is an uncivil and tiresome person who falls foul of everything that is not to his liking. Let him be satisfied with correcting himself, and not to appear to reprove in others all that he declines to do, and be a censor of public morals : He may be wise without ostentation, without exciting envy (Seneca). Let him avoid those authoritative and unmannerly airs and that puerile ambition of trying to appear more clever, because he is different, and to gain a reputation for being critical and original. As it is becoming only in great poets to indulge in poetical licence, so to assume unconventional privileges is tolerable only in great and illustrious souls. If Socrates and Aristippus have failed to observe the rules of good conduct and custom, let him not imagine that he is licensed to do the same ; their great and divine merits authorized that liberty (Cicero) .

He shall be taught to enter into no dispute or argument but where he sees a champion worthy to wrestle with, and even then not to employ all the turns that may serve him, but only those that may serve him best. He shall be taught to be particular in choosing and sifting his reasons, to prefer pertinence, and consequently brevity. Instruct him above all to quit his arms and surrender in the face of truth as soon as he perceives it, whether it appear in his opponent's arguments or in his own, through being better advised. For he will not be sitting in a professor's chair to read a prepared lecture. He is not pledged to any cause but in so far as he approves of it. Nor will he be of that profession in which the liberty of repenting and acknowledging one's errors is sold for good ready money. Nor is he obliged by any necessity to defend all the things that have been prescribed and recommended to him (Cicero).

If his governor be of my way of thinking, he will make him desire to be a very loyal, a very affectionate, and a very brave servant to his prince ; but he will cool in him any desire to become attached to him by any but public duty. Not to speak of many other disadvantages which greatly impair our freedom through these private obligations, the judgement of a man who is bought and salaried is either less free and unalloyed, or is tainted by imprudence and in-

gratitude. A courtier can have neither free choice nor will to think and speak otherwise than favourably of a master who has chosen him from among so many thousands of other subjects, to feed and raise him with his own hand. This favour and advantage will corrupt, not without some reason, his freedom, and dazzle him. Therefore we see the language of those people to differ ordinarily from any other language in the state, and little to be trusted in such matters.

Let his conscience and his virtue shine forth in his speech, and be guided solely by reason. Make him understand that to confess the error he discovers in his own reasoning, though he himself alone perceive it, is a mark of judgement and honesty, which are the chief qualities he aims at ; that obstinac}^ and contention are vulgar qualities, most apparent in the basest minds ; that to correct oneself and change one's mind, and in the heat of ardour to abandon a weak position, is a sign of strong, rare, and philosophical qualities.

Let him be advised, when in company, to have his eyes everywhere, for I have found that the chief places are commonly seized upon by the least capable men, and that greatness of fortune is seldom combined with ability. I have observed that whilst at the high end of a table the conversation has turned upon the beauty of a tapestry or the flavour of a Malmsey wine, many witty things spoken at the other end have been lost to them.

He will sound the depths of every man : a neatherd, a mason, a passing stranger ; he should utilize and borrow from each according to his wares, for everything is of use in the household ; he will learn something even from the follies and weaknesses of others. By observing the graces and manners of each, he will plant in himself the seeds of emulation of the good, and contempt of the bad.

Suggest to his fancy an honest curiosity that will make him inquire into all things ; he should see everything uncommon in his surroundings : a building, a fountain, a man, the scene of an ancient battle, the passage of Caesar or of Charlemagne :

*What land 's adust with heat, what numb'd with snow,
And all the winds to Italy that blow. (Propertius.)*

He will inquire into the character, the resources and the alliances of this and that prince : things very pleasant to learn and very useful to know.

His intercourse with men will comprise, as I understand

it, and principally, those who live only in the memory of books. Through the medium of histories he will hold converse with the great souls of the best ages. That is an empty study, if a man list, but also, if a man list, it is a study of inestimable fruit, and the only study, as Plato tells us, that the Lacedemonians had reserved for their share. What profit will he not reap, to that end, by reading the Lives of our Plutarch ? But let my tutor remember the object of his charge, and impress upon his pupil not so much the date of the ruin of Carthage as the character of Hannibal and Scipio, not so much where MarceUus died, as why it was unwort% of his duty to die there. Let him not so much teach him history as to give his opinions on it. This is in my opinion of all subjects that to which we apply our minds most diversely. I have read in Livy a hundred things that another has not read in him. Plutarch has read in him a hundred besides what I have been able to read, and perhaps besides what the author put there. To some he is a purely grammatical study, to others the analysis of a philosophy in which the most abstruse parts of our nature penetrate.

There are in Plutarch many ample treatises most worthy to be known, for he is, to my mind, the master-worker in such matters ; but there are a thousand subjects that he has merely touched upon : he merely points with his finger the way we may go, if we please, and sometimes contents himself with giving a mere dig at the heart of a subject. We have to extract it and exhibit it in the open market-place. As an example, that saying of his, ' That the inhabitants of Asia served one man through being unable to pronounce one single syllable, which was Ho perhaps suggested to La Boetie the matter and occasion for his Servitude Volontaire. Only to see Plutarch pick out a trivial action in a man's life, or a word which seems of no import, that in itself is a treatise. It is a pity that men of understanding are so fond of brevity ; no doubt their reputation gains by it, but it is our loss. Plutarch had rather that we applaud him for his jud gemen t than for his knowlec^e, he would rather leave us wrbE an appetite for him, than satiated. He knew that even of good things we may say too many, and that Alexandridas justly reproved him who was delivering a very good harangue to the Ephore, but which was too long : ^ 0 stranger^ yon say what yon should, but otherwise than you should.' They who have a slender body make it stouter with padding ; they whose matter is thin thicken it with words.

Mixing with society has a marvellous effect in clearing up a man's judgement. We are all compressed and heaped up

within ourselves, and our sight is shortened to the length of our noses. Some one asked Socrates whence he was. He did not answer ' Of Athens but ' Of the world He, whose imagination was fuller and wider, embraced the universe as his city, extended his acquaintance, his society, and his affection over all mankind ; he was not as we are, who look no further than our feet. When the vines in my village are nipped by the frost, my priest argues therefrom God's anger with the human race, and concludes that the Cannibals are already dying of thirst. ^ Who is there that, seeing our civil wars, does not cry out that this machine, the world, is being overthrown, and that the day of judgement is seizing us by the throat, without calling to mind that many worse things have happened, and that, notwithstanding, ten thousand parts of the world are meanwhile having a merry time ? For my part, considering the licence and impunity they enjoy, I wonder to see them so gentle and moderate. To one who feels the hail coming down on his head, the whole hemisphere seems to be in storm and tempest. And a Savoyard said that ' if that fool of a French king had been well able to look after his own interest, he might have become steward to the household of my Duke His imagination could picture nothing higher and greater than his own master. We are all unconsciously in this error, an error fraught with great consequence and harm. But whoever shall conjure up in his fancy, as in a picture, that great form of our mother Nature, in her full majesty ; whoever reads in her face so universal and so constant a variety ; whoever observes himself therein, and not only himself, but a whole kingdom, to be no bigger than a point made with a very delicate brush, he alone estimates things according to their true proportion.

^ Literally, ' have got the pip *.

This great world, which some yet multiply as a species under one genus, is the mirror wherein we are to behold ourselves, in order to know ourselves from the right point of view. In a word, I should wish it to be my pupil's book. So many ways of looking at things, so many sects, judgements, opinions, laws and customs, teach us to form a sound estimate of our own, and teach our judgement to discover its own imperfection and its natural feebleness ; and that is no small apprenticeship. So many disturbances of State and changes in public fortune instruct us to make no great miracle of our own. So many names, so many victories and conquests buried in oblivion, render ridiculous the hope of eternalizing our name by the capture of half a score of arquebusiers or of a wretched hovel that is only known to those that took it. The pride and arrogance of so many

foreign pomps and ceremonies, the inflated majesty of so many courts and grandeurs, assures and fortifies our eyes to bear, without blinking, the brilliance of ours. So many millions of men interred before our time, encourage us to have no fear of finding as good company in the other world ; and so with the rest.

Our life, said Pythagoras, may be likened to the great and populous assembly of the Olympic games. Some exercise their bodies to win fame in the contests ; others bring merchandise to sell for profit. There are some, and they are not the worst, who seek no other fruit but to look on and see how and why everything is done, and to be spectators of the lives of other men, in order to consider and regulate their own.

Examples may fitly illustrate all the most profitable discourses of philosophy, which should be the touchstone of human actions and by which they should be ruled. He shall be told,

*What to wish with unreproved desires :
How far the genuine use of wealth extends ;
And the just claims of country, kindred, friends ;
What heaven would have us be, and where our stand,
In this great whole, is fixed by high command.
Learn what we are, and for what purpose born ; (Propertius.)*

what is knowledge and what is ignorance ; what ought to be the aim of study ; what valour, temperance, and justice are ; what the difference is between ambition and avarice, servitude and subjection, licence and liberty ; by what token a man may know true and solid contentment ; how far we should fear death, pain, and disgrace ;

What toils to shun, what dangers to despise ; (Virgil.)

by what springs we are moved, and the cause of so many different stirrings in us. For it seems to me that the first ideas with which we should soak his mind ought to be those which regulate his conduct and his understanding, which will teach him to know himself and how to die well and live a good life.

Among the liberal arts let us begin with the art which gives us liberty. They are all indeed of some service in instructing us in the right conduct of our life, as all other things do in some sort. But let us choose that which directly and professedly serves that end.

If we knew how to restrict the functions of our life within

their just and natural limits, we should find that the better part of the sciences in use are of no use to us, and that even in those which are, there are many very unnecessary lengths and depths, and that we should do better to leave them alone ; and, following Socrates' system of education, limit the course of our studies to those where utility is needed :

*So, then, have courage to be wise ! Begin !
He that would mend his life, yet still delays
To set to work, is like the boor who stays
Till the broad stream that bars his way is gone ;
But on still flows the stream, and ever will flow on. (Horace.)*

*It is very silly and foolish to teach our children,
The circling Fishes and the Lion brave,
And Capricorn, that wades the Western wave, (Propertius.)*

*the knowledge of the stars and the motion of the eighth
sphere, before teaching them their own movements ;
A fig for Pleiads or Bootes' stars ! (Anacreon.)*

Anaximenes writes to Pythagoras : ' What sense is there in musing over the secret of the stars, when death and slavery are ever present to mine eyes ? ' (for at that time the kings of Persia were preparing to wage war against his country). Every one should say thus : ' A prey to ambition, avarice, temerity, superstition, and having within me other such enemies of life, am I to go about dreaming of the world's revolution ? '

After he has been taught what will make him wiser and better, his tutor will explain to him the nature of Logic, Physics, Geometry, Rhetoric, and, his judgement having been already formed, he will soon master the science that he has chosen. His lessons will be carried on, now by conversation, now by „ book ; sometimes the governor will put into his hands the author suited to the purpose, at other times he will give him the substance and marrow ready masticated. If the governor is not himself sufficiently familiar with books to discover in them all the fine teachings for his purpose, you may associate with him some man of letters, who will provide the necessary munitions to be dealt out and dispensed to his nursling. And who will doubt but that this kind of lesson will be easier and more natural than those of Gaza ? ^ There we have precepts so thorny and unattractive, words so empty and fleshless, that there is no getting hold of them, nothing to quicken the understanding. Here, on the other hand, is something for the mind to bite and feed on. The fruit of it will be incomparably greater, and also sooner matured.

It is a great pity that things have come to such a pass in our time, that Philosophy, even with men of intelligence, is become a mere name, empty and fanciful, a thing of no use and no value, either in people's opinion or in reality. I believe the cause of this to be the sophistries which have seized and blocked the approaches to her. It is very wrong to paint her as a thing inaccessible to children, of a surly, frowning, and repulsive aspect. Who, I should like to know, has disguised her under this false, pale, and hideous mask? There can be nothing more blithe and cheerful, more lusty and, I might almost say, more wanton. She preaches nothing but merry-making and a good time. A melancholy and hang-dog look is a clear sign that she dwells not there.

^ One of the many Greek scholars who came to Italy in the fifteenth century, and author of a Greek grammar, which is here referred to.

Demetrius the grammarian, coming upon a group of philosophers seated together in the temple at Delphi, said to them: 'Either I am much deceived or, to judge by your calm and cheerful looks, you are not engaged in very serious converse.' To which one of them, Heracleon of Megara, replied: 'It is for those who are inquiring whether the future of the verb /SdXXio has a double X, or searching the derivation of the comparatives x^tpov and ^eXrLovy and the superlatives [optical scanless Greek] and to knit their brows when discussing their science. But as to philosophical discussions, they are wont to make glad and rejoice those who carry them on, not to make them look sour and gloomy/

*Detect we oft the torments of the mind,
In the sick frame which love to lurk behind ;
Oft of suppress'd delight the lines we trace.
Marked on the plastic features of the face. (Juvenal.)*

The soul that harbours philosophy ought, by reason of its healthfulness, to render the body healthful too. She should make her tranquillity and happiness to shine forth ; should fashion the outward behaviour to her own mould, and so arm it with a graceful assurance, an active and joyous carriage, a serene and contented countenance. The most evident sign of wisdom is a constant cheerfulness ; her state is ever serene, like the things beyond the moon. It is Baroco and Baralipion ^ that make their devotees look smoke-dried and muddy, and not she ; they know her only by hearsay. Why I she makes it her object to still the tempest of the soul, to teach hunger and fever to laugh, not by a few imaginary epicycles, but by natural and palpable reasons. She has Virtue for her end, which is not, as they say in the schools,

set on the summit of a precipitous, rugged and inaccessible mountain. Such as have approached her hold her to be, on the contrary, settled on a beautiful table-land, fertile and flourishing, from whence she sees all things below her ; but it may be reached pleasantly, by one who knows the direction, by shady, green, and fragrant ways, and by a smooth and easy incline, like that of the heavenly vaults. Through not being familiar with this supreme, beautiful, triumphant, loving, delicious as well as courageous Virtue, this professed and implacable enemy to bitterness, displeasure, fear and constraint, having Nature for her guide, Fortune and Pleasure for her companions, they have gone, and in their feeble imagination created that foolish, melancholy, quarrelsome, spiteful, threatening and frowning image, and set it up on an isolated rock among the brambles : a ghost to frighten people !

^ Two of a series of artificial words used in scholastic logic, the vowels of which denote certain forms of syllogism. See any elementary book on Logic,

My tutor, who knows it to be his duty to store his pupil's mind as much, or rather more, with affection than with awe and reverence for virtue, will be able to tell him that the poets are in agreement with the general view, and make it palpable to him that the gods have made it a more sweaty toil to approach Venus's bower than the chambers of Pallas. And when he begins to have feelings, and is introduced to a Bradamante or an Angelica,^ as a mistress to be enjoyed, on the one hand a natural, active, generous, and virile beauty, though no virago, and on the other a soft, effeminate, coquettish, and artificial beauty ; the one disguised as a youth, wearing a shining helmet, the other dressed as a girl with a pearl-embroidered head-dress, he will look upon even his love as a manly one, if he chooses differently to that effeminate Phrygian shepherd.^

He will give him this new lesson : That the grandeur and value of true virtue lies in the facility, the pleasure, and usefulness of its practice : it is so far from being difficult that children as well as men, the simple as well as the subtle, may possess it. The means of attaining it is moderation, not effort. Socrates, her first favourite, consciously abandons effort, to guide towards her by easy and natural stages. She is the nursing-mother of human joys. By making them righteous she makes them pure and certain. By moderating them she keeps them in breath and appetite. By curtailing those she denies, she whets our desire for those she allows, and like a mother abundantly leaves us all that nature requires, even to satiety, if not to lassitude (unless peradven-

ture we mean to say that the regimen that stops the toper before he is drunk, the glutton before he is surfeited, the lecher before he loses his hair, is an enemy to our pleasures). If she misses the happy lot of the vulgar she will escape its consequences ; or she will do without them and will invent others, wholly her own, no longer fleeting and unsteady. She can be rich and powerful and learned, and lie on perfumed mattresses. She loves life, she loves beauty and glory and health. But her own particular duty is to know how to use these blessings temperately, and to lose them bravely : a duty much more noble than laborious, without which the whole course of life is unnatural, turbulent, and deformed, and such a life is more really dotted with those dangerous reefs, thickets, and monsters.

^ See Ariosto's Orlando Furioso.

® Alluding to the Judgement of Paris.

If this pupil happens to be of so wayward a disposition, that he would rather listen to a fictitious tale than to the narrative of some fine voyage or a wise conversation, when he chances to hear it ; if he be one who, at the beat of a drum that arms the youthful ardour of his companions, turns from it to another that invites him to the tricks of the mountebanks ; who, when he has the choice, does not find more pleasure and delight in returning, a dust-covered victor, from a battle-field, than from the tennis-court or the dance, with the prizes of that exercise, I see no other remedy but that his governor should take an early opportunity to choke him off, if there are no witnesses,^ or bind him apprentice to a pastry-cook in some good town, though he were the son of a duke ; in accordance with Plato's precept, ' that children should be placed, not according to the resources of their father, but according to the resources of their mind.'

Since it is philosophy that teaches us to live, and since childhood finds its lessons there as well the other ages, why is it not communicated to children ?

As clay thou art so moist, so pliant still.

Adapted now to any shape at will —

Then take the wheel, this constant labour thine.

Thy shape to form, thy ruggedness to fine. (Pbesitjs.)

We are taught to live, when life is past. A hundred scholars have caught the pox before they have come to read Aristotle On Temperance. That is wrong. Cicero said that though he should live the lives of two men, he would not give him-

self the leisure to study the lyric poets. And to me those sophisters are still more deplorably unprofitable. Our child has much less time to spare : he owes the schoolmaster only the first fifteen or sixteen years of his life ; the rest he owes to action. Let us employ that short time in the necessary instructions. Banish all those thorny subtleties of logic, by which our lives cannot be amended ; take the simple teachings of philosophy, know how to choose and treat them aright ; they are easier to understand than a tale of Boccaccio. A child is capable of doing so on leaving his nurse, much more so than of learning to read and write. Philosophy has teachings for the infancy as well as the decrepitude of man.

^ These last words, which obviously were not to be taken seriously, seem to have so disturbed Montaigne's literary executors that they suppressed them. They have not hitherto appeared in any except the latest critical editions.

I am of Plutarch's mind, that Aristotle did right in not wasting his great pupil's time teaching him the trick of composing syllogisms or the elements of geometry, but rather furnished him with good precepts touching valour, prowess, magnanimity, and temperance, and the assurance to fear nothing ; and, with this ammunition, sent him, as yet a boy, to subjugate the empire of the world, with only thirty thousand foot, four thousand horse, and forty thousand crowns. As for the other arts and sciences, he says, Alexander honoured them no doubt, and commended their excellence and fascinations, but, for all the pleasure he might take in them, he was not to be easily surprised into loving them and wishing to cultivate them.

*Old and young, let these your thoughts engage,
They give the mind support, and cheer old age, (Persius.)*

As Epicurus writes at the beginning of his letter to Menicius ;

' Let not the youngest turn away from the study of philosophy, nor the oldest weary of it.' He who does otherwise seems to say, either that it is not yet time, or no longer time, to live happily.

For all those reasons I would not have this youth kept a prisoner ; I would not hand him over to the melancholy humours of a hot-tempered schoolmaster. I would not break his spirit by keeping him, as some others do, to hard labour and the torture for fourteen or fifteen hours a day, like a porter. Nor should I think it well, if, in consequence of a disposition to solitude and melancholy, he were found

to be addicted to a too close application to his books, to encourage that tendency in him : that renders them unfit for society and conversation, and diverts them from better occupations. How many men have I not seen in my time dulled by this injudicious avidity for learning ! Carneades was so infatuated with it that he had no leisure to comb his hair and pare his nails.

Nor would I spoil his noble manners by contact with the uncivilized and barbarous manners of others. French wisdom was of old proverbially known as a wisdom that took root early but had no stay. Indeed, we still see that nothing can compare in pretty manners with the little children in France ; but they generally disappoint the hopes that have been conceived of them, and when they are grown men we do not see them excel in anything. I have heard intelligent men declare that they are made as dull as they are by being sent to those colleges which so abound in this country.

For our boy a closet, a garden, the table and bed, solitude, company, morning and evening, all hours shall be one to him, all places shall be his study ; for Philosophy which, since it forms our judgement and character, shall be his principal study, has this privilege of having a hand in everything. The orator Isocrates having been entreated at a banquet to speak of his art, he was right, as we all believe, to reply : " Now is not the time to do what I can do ; and that which it is now time to do, I cannot do.' For to deliver harangues and disputations on rhetoric to a company assembled for laughter and good cheer, would be a too harmonious mixture. And as much might be said of all the other sciences. But with regard to Philosophy, in that part of it which treats of man and his duties and functions, it has been the common opinion of all the sages that, on account of the sweetness of her conversation, she should be excluded neither from sports nor banquets. And Plato having invited her to his Symposium we may see how she entertains the company, how pleasant and well-suited to the time and place is her discourse, although it is one of his loftiest and most salutary dissertations ;

*To grow proficient in the wisdom which
Is precious equally to poor and rich —
Which, if neglected, young and old will find,
Leaves a long train of pain and loss behind. (Horace.)*

Thus he will be without doubt less idle than others. But, as in pacing a gallery, though we walk three times as much, we do not become so weary as in a set journey, so our lesson, coming by chance, without being tied to time and place, and

mingling with all our actions, will slip by easily and insensibly. Even games and exercises will form a good part of his study, running, wrestling, music, dancing, the chase, the management of a horse and use of weapons. I would have a graceful exterior combined with tactful manners ; the body and the mind should be fashioned at the same time. It is not a soul, it is not a body that is being trained : it is a man ; they must not be separated. And, as Plato says, we must not train the one without the other, but drive them abreast, like a pair of horses harnessed to one pole. And, to hear him, does he not appear to give more time and more care to bodily exercises, and to hold that the mind is exercised at the same time, and not the contrary ?

For the rest, this education is to be conducted with a mild severity, contrary to the usual practice. Instead of making study attractive to children, they only suggest to their minds horrors and cruelties. Away with violence and compulsion ! There is nothing to my mind more calculated to deaden and brutahze a generous nature. If you wish him to fear shame and chastisement do not harden him to them. Harden him to sweat and cold, wind and sun, and the dangers that he is to despise ; wean him from all effeminacy and delicacy in clothing and bedding, in eating and drinking ; accustom him to everything. Let him not be a pretty and namby-pamby youth, but a fresh and sturdy boy. As boy and man I have ever been of this belief and opinion, and am so still in my old age.

But, among other things, I have always disliked the discipline of most of our colleges. They would perhaps have failed less disastrously by inclining to the side of indigence. It is a regular jail of imprisoned youth. They become undisciplined by being punished before they are so. Go there at lesson time : you whl hear nothing but crying and shouting, both of boys under execution and of masters drunk with rage. What a way to arouse an appetite for learning in those tender and timid souls, to drive them to it with a terrifying scowl and hands armed with rods ! An iniquitous and pernicious system ! Besides that, as Quintilian has very well observed, this imperious authority is attended with dangerous consequences, and especially in the matter of punishment. How much more becomingly would their class-room be strewn with flowers and green boughs, instead of with bloody stumps of birch ! I would have pictures of Joy and Gladness, of Flora and the Graces, such as the philosopher Speusippus had in his school. Where their profit is, there let also their recreation be. The viands that are wholesome for children should be sweetened^ and the harmful ones made bitter with gall.

It is wonderful how solicitous Plato shows himself, in his Laws, about the gaiety and pastimes of the youth of his city, and how much he dwells on their races, games, songs, leaps, and dances, of which he says that antiquity has given the ordering and patronage to the gods themselves, Apollo, Minerva, and the Muses. He gives a thousand precepts for his gymnasium, but wastes very little time over literary studies, and seems to recommend poetry chiefly for the sake of the music.

Everything singular and unconventional in our manners and bearing is to be avoided as inimical to social intercourse, and as abnormal. Who would not be astonished at the constitution of Demophon, the steward of Alexander's household, who sweated in the shade and shivered in the sun ? I have known one who would fly from the smell of an apple sooner than from the shot of an arquebus ; I have seen others frightened by a mouse, others vomit at the sight of cream or the tousling of a feather-bed ; and Germanicus could endure neither the sight nor the crowing of a cook. To account for this there may perhaps be some hidden quality, but it could, I think, be subdued by any one who set about it in good time. Training has done this for me, not indeed without some pains : my appetite accommodates itself indifferently to all things that men feed on, excepting beer.

The body being still supple should be bent to every fashion and custom, and, provided that he keep his appetite and will under control, a young man should boldly adapt himself to all nations and companies, even to the point of excess and licentiousness, if need be. In practice he should follow usage ; let him be able to do all things, and love to do only the good. The philosophers themselves do not commend Callisthenes for losing the good graces of his master Alexander by refusing to hold his own with him in drinking. He shall laugh, he shall wanton, he shall live riotously with his prince. Even in the latter I would see him outdo his fellows in strength and vigour ; and if he refrains from doing ill, let it be, not from lack of power and knowledge, but from lack of will : there is a great difference between not wishing to sin, and not knowing how to sin (Seneca).^

^ The above paragraph was condemned by the Sacred College in Rome,

I thought I was passing a compliment on a lord, one who was as far removed from such excesses as any man in France, by asking him, in a company of good fellows, how often in his life he had got drunk in the interests of his king's affairs, in Germany. He took it in the same spirit and re-

plied ' three times and related the circumstances. I have known some who, from lack of that faculty, have got into great trouble, when they had to associate with people of that nation. I have often had occasion to remark with great admiration the marvellous nature of Alcibiades, who was so easily able to suit himself to such diverse fashions, without prejudice to his health, now outdoing the Persians in pomp and sumptuousness, now the Lacedemonians in frugality and austerity ; as chaste in Sparta as he was voluptuous in Ionia.

*Wealthy or poor, in high or humble place,
All sat on Aristippus with a grace. (Horace.)*

So would I form my pupil :

*But lift a man into a higher sphere
Who in a blanket wrapt his lore austere,
And 'twill surprise me greatly, if he bear
His change of life with a becoming air. (Horace.)*

These are my lessons ; he who puts them in practice has profited better than he who knows them. If you see it, you hear it ; if you hear it, you see it.

God forbid, says somebody in Plato, that philosophizing should mean learning many things and discoursing on the arts ! This art of living well, which is of all the arts the greatest, they have followed in their lives rather than in their studies (Cicero).

Leo, a prince of the Phliasians, inquiring of Heraclides Ponticus ^ what science, what art he professed, he replied :

" I know neither art nor science, but I am a philosopher."

Some one reproachfully asking Diogenes why, being ignorant, he meddled with philosophy, he said : ' I meddle with it to so much the better purpose.' Hegesias entreated him to read some book to him, whereupon he replied : ' You are jesting : you choose real and natural figs, not painted ones ; why do you not also choose real and natural exercises, instead of written ones ? '

#when Montaigne was there in 1580. He promised to correct it, but appears to have forgotten his promise.

^ Actually, Pythagoras ; but the saying is quoted by Cicero from Heraclides of Pontus.

He should not so much say his lesson, as do it. He should repeat it in his actions. We shall see if there is prudence in his enterprises, if there is goodness and justice in his behaviour, if there is judgement and grace in his speaking, manliness in his malades, soberness in his play, temperance in his pleasures, indifference in his tastes, whether meat, fish, wine, or water, order in his economy ; if his learning serves, not to show off his knowledge, but to regulate his[^] life ; if he obeys himself and acts in conformity with his [^]principles (Cicero).

The true mirror of our speech is the course of our lives.

Zeuxidamus replied, to one who asked him why the Lacedaemonians did not draw up in writing their rules of prowess, and give them to their young men to read : ' Because we desire to accustom them to deeds, not words.' Compare with our pupil at the end of fifteen or sixteen years one of your college Latinists, who has spent the same time on merely learning to speak. The world is all babble, and I never saw the man who did not rather say more than less than he should. And yet the half of our lives goes that way : we are kept four or five years listening to words and stitching them into sentences, as many again in proportioning them into a great body, extending into four or five parts, another five at least in learning to mix and interweave them briefly in some subtle fashion.[^] Let us leave that to those who make express profession of it.

One day on my way to Orleans I met, in the plain on this side of Clery, two college professors who were coming to Bordeaux, about fifty paces distant from one another. Further behind them I saw a company with their lord at then* head, who was the late Monsieur le Comte de la Rochefoucault. One of my men inquired of the foremost of the teachers who was the gentleman coming after him. Not seeing the retinue that followed after, and thinking his colleague was meant, he replied humorously : " That is not a gentleman ; he is a grammarian, and I am a logician." [^]

[^] Montaigne here gives an outline of the school curriculum of those days : five years in the ' classes de grammaire five in the ' classe des humanites and five in the ' classe de logique

® i. e., a professor of grammar and a professor of logic.

Now our object is, on the contrary, to make a gentleman and not a grammarian or a logician ; let them abuse their spare time : our business lies elsewhere. But if our pupil is well furnished with matter, words will follow soon enough ; if they are not willing to follow, he will drag them.

I hear some making excuses for being unable to express themselves ; they put on an air of having their brains well filled with many :^e ideas which, for want of eloquence, they are unable to bring to the light of day : that is all bluff. Do you know what I think ? They are shadows thrown by some shapeless conceptions, which they are unable to clear up and unravel within their minds, and consequently to produce out of them ; they do not yet understand themselves. See them with their little stammer when on the point of giving birth, and you will conclude that their travail is not at the delivery stage, but at that of conception, and that they are only licking that unfinished matter.^ For my part I hold, and Socrates lays it down as an axiom, that he who has a clear and vivid idea in his mind will express it in some language or other, though it be the Bergamask patois, or, if he be dumb, by signs :

Once master that and words will freely follow. (Horace.)

And, as another no less poetically said in his prose, when matter occupies the mind, words come of themselves (Seneca) ;

and another, the things themselves carry words along with them (Cicero).

He knows nothing of ablatives, conjunctives, substantives, or grammar, but no more does his lackey or a herring- wife of the Petit Pont, and yet they will talk to you to your heart's content, if you wish to hear them, and will perhaps stumble as little over the rules of their language as the best master of arts in France. He knows no rhetoric, nor is he able, in a preface, to captivate the goodwill of the ' gentle reader ', and he does not care to know it. In truth all those artificial colours are easily eclipsed by the light of a simple and artless truth. Those pretty tricks serve only to beguile the vulgar, who are incapable of taking in a stronger and more solid meat ; as Apeiron very clearly shows in Tacitus. The ambassadors of Samos were come to Cleomenes, King of Sparta, prepared with a long and elegant harangue, to incite him to war against the tyrant Poly crates. After allowing them to have their say he replied : ' As to the commencement and exordium, I no more remember it, nor consequently the middle ; and as for your conclusion, I will do nothing of the kind.' There we see a fine answer, methinks, and speechifiers finely snubbed 1

^ As a bear was supposed to lick its cubs into shape,

And what about this other ? The Athenians were about

to choose between two architects to carry out a large building contract. The first and more affected came forward with a very elegant speech ready prepared on the subject of his work, and carried the verdict of the people in his favour. But the other, in three words : ' O Athenian lords, what this man has said, I will do.'

When Cicero was at the height of his eloquence many were carried away by admiration ; but Cato only laughed and said : ' We have an amusing consul.' ^ Whether it comes before or after, a useful maxim and a clever saying are always in season : if it does not go well with that which precedes, nor with that which follows, it is well in itself. I am not one of those who think that a good rhythm makes a good poem : let him make a short syllable long, if he pleases ; that matters little : if the original ideas please me, if the wit and judgement have done their office well, then we have a good poet, I shall say, but a poor versifier,

With humour delicate, the lines are hard. (Horace.)

Though this poet's work, says Horace, lose all its seams and measures.

*Take from Lucilius' verses, or from mine,
The cadences and measures of the line ;
Then change their order, and the words transpose . . .
And still the poet's scattered limbs it shows ; (Horace.)*

he will not on that account belie his promise : the pieces in themselves will be fine. That is what Menander meant when, being taunted, as the day drew near for which he had promised a comedy, that he had not yet set his hand to it, he replied : ' It is composed and ready ; it only remains to add the verses . ' Having the matter and the details arranged in his mind, he made Kttle account of the rest. Now that Ronsard and Du Bellay have brought our French poetry to honour, every little prentice rimester is swelling with words, and arrays his rhythms almost as well as they : more sound than sense (Seneca). In the eyes of the vulgar there never were so many poets. But, in proportion to the ease with which they copy their rhythms, they fall short of imitating the rich descriptions of the one and the delicate inventions of the other.

^ Montaigne's memory has again played him false. Cicero is defending Murena against Cato, who has accused him of bribery, and, after the manner of defending counsel, is purposely making the judges laugh by casting ridicule on Cato's Stoical philosophy, when Cato remarks with a smile to the bystanders, ' We have indeed a most laughable consul.'

Yes, but what will he do if he be hard driven by the sophistic subtlety of some syllogism ? ' Ham makes us drink ; drink quenches our thirst : therefore ham quenches our thirst.' Let him snap his fingers at it : that show more subtlety than any reply.

Let him borrow that witty counter-finesse of Aristippus : ' Why should I untie it, since, tied as it is, it gives me trouble ? ' Some one, debating with Cleanthes, was talking dialectical subtleties, whereupon Chrysippus said : ' Play these juggling tricks with children, and do not divert the serious thoughts of a man of years.' If these silly quibbles, twisted and thorny sophisms (Cicero), are intended to inculcate a falsehood, they are dangerous ; but if they remain without effect and only move him to laughter, I do not see why he should be on his guard against them. There are some so foolish that they will turn aside from their path for a quarter of a league to run after a fine word, or who fit not words to things, but search for things, quite out of the purpose, to fit their words (Quintilian). And, as another says, there are some who, attracted by some word that takes their fancy, are led to something they had no intention to treat of (Seneca). I am more ready to twist a good sentence, in order to sew it upon myself, than to unwind my thread to go in search of it.^ On the contrary, it is the duty of words to obey and follow, and if French words cannot get there, Gascon words may succeed. Things should be paramount and they should so fill the mind of the hearer that he thinks no more of the words. The speech that I like is simple and natural speech, the same on paper as on the lips : a succulent, nervous, short, and concise manner of speaking, not dainty and nicely combed so much as vehement and brisk :

The words that strike the ear will please none most ;
{From an epitaph on Lucan.)

difficult rather than tedious, free from affectation, loose, irregular, and bold ; every piece to form a body in itself ; not in the manner of the professor, the preaching friar or the pleading advocate, but rather soldier-like, as Suetonius called Caesar's style ; and yet I do not quite see why he called it so.^

^ Perhaps the meaning of this obscure sentence is : I would sooner alter the words of a thought to incorporate it into my prose than modify the course of my ideas in order to be able to introduce it.

I have been wont to copy that disorder in dress affected by our young men : a cloak worn negligently, the hood on one shoulder, ungartered hose, showing a haughty disdain of those foreign adornments, and careless of all art. But I find this carelessness still better applied to the style of speaking. Every kind of affectation, especially in the French gaiety and freedom, is unbecoming a courtier. And in a monarchy every gentleman should be trained to bear himself like a courtier. Wherefore we do well to bear a little to the side of the natural and contemptuous.

I do not like a texture that shows the knots and the seams, just as in a handsome body we must not be able to count the bones and veins. Let the language that is devoted to truth be simple and artless (Seneca). Who can speak so elaborately without falling into affectation ? (Seneca).

The eloquence that diverts us to itself prejudices its subject-matter.

As in our dress it is the sign of a little mind to seek distinction by some particular and unusual fashion, so in language the search after novel phrases and little-known words proceeds from a puerile and pedantic ambition. O that I could use no other but those in use in the market-halls in Paris ! Aristophanes the grammarian showed no sense when he blamed Epicurus for the simplicity of his language and the aim of his oratory, which was nothing more than perspicuity of speech. A whole nation is able at once to imitate speech on account of its facility, but to imitate judgement and invention is not so easy. Most readers, having found the gown that fits, very falsely imagine that they hold the body that fits it.

Strength and sinews cannot be borrowed ; the cloak and attire may be borrowed.

Most of those who associate with me speak the same language as these Essays, but I know not if they think the same thoughts.

^ The edition of Suetonius's Life of Caesar which Montaigne used had a faulty reading of the passage in question. Suetonius made no such remark, and Montaigne's doubt goes the way of the faulty reading.

The Athenians, says Plato, have for their share the study of fullness and elegance in speech, the Lacedemonians that of brevity, the Cretans that of fertility of conception rather than of language : these are the best. Zeno used to say that he had two kinds of disciples : those he called *cjSAoXoyou?*,

curious to learn things, who were his favourites ; and those he called XoyocfitXovs, who cared only about language. This is not to say that to speak well is not a good and fine thing, but it is not as good as some make it, and it vexes me that we make that the business of our whole life. I should like in the first place to know my own language well, and that of my neighbours with whom I have most to do.

There is no doubt that Greek and Latin are a great and fine accomplishment, but they are bought too dearly. I will here tell of a method by which they may be acquired more cheaply than they usually are, and which was tried on myself. Let him who will make use of it.

My late father, having made all possible inquiries among men of learning and understanding with regard to a perfect system of education, became aware of the disadvantages of the methods then in use : they told him that the length of time we spend in learning the languages of the ancient Greeks and Romans, which cost them no labour, was the sole reason why we could not attain to the knowledge and greatness of soul of those nations. I do not believe that to be the sole cause. However, the result of my father's inquiries was that he hit upon this expedient : whilst still in the nurse's hands, and, before the first unloosening of my tongue, he placed me in charge of a German,[^] who afterwards died a famous physician in France, entirely ignorant of our language, and very well versed in Latin. This man, whom he had expressly sent for to this end, and who was engaged at a very high salary, had me continually on his hands. With him were joined two others, less learned than he, who had to attend me and relieve him. These spoke to me no other language but Latin. As to the rest of the household, it was an inviolable rule that neither my father nor my mother, nor any valet or housemaid, ever spoke in my presence any but the few Latin words which each had learned to jargon with me. It is wonderful how much they all profited by it. My father and mother learned enough Latin to understand it, and acquired a sufficient knowledge of it to use it in case of need, as did also the other domestics who were most attached to my service. In short we all became so latinized, that it overflowed to our villages around, where to this day may be heard several Latin names of artisans and tools, which through frequent use have taken root. As for myself I was more than six years old before I understood any more French or Perigordin than I did Arabic.

[^] One Dr. Horstanus, who afterwards was a professor at the College de Guienne at Bordeaux.

And so, without any artificial means, without any book, without grammar or teaching, without any rod and without tears, I learned a Latin quite as pure as that of my school-master. For with me it was never mixed or adulterated. If, as a test, they desired to set me an exercise after the college fashion, where others were given a French one, I had a piece of bad Latin to turn into good. And Nicolas Grouchi, who wrote *De Comitibus Romanorum*, Guillaume Guerente, who annotated Aristotle, George Buchanan, that great Scottish poet, Marc Antoine Muret, whom France and Italy have acknowledged as the best orator of his time, my private tutors, have often said to me that in my childhood I had that language so ready and handy, that they were afraid of accosting me. Buchanan, whom I afterwards saw in attendance on the late Monsieur the Marechal de Brissac, told me that he was engaged in writing a book on the education of children, and that he took mine as a model ; for at that time he had charge of that Count de Brissac who has since shown himself so brave and valorous.^

^ He was killed at the siege of Mtissidan, quite near to Montaigne's residence, in 1569.

As for Greek, of which I have as good as no knowledge whatever, my father designed to have me taught by artificial means, but in a new way : in the form of recreation and exercise. We bandied our declensions about, after the manner of those who, with the help of certain games played on boards, learned arithmetic and geometry. For, among other things, he had been advised to give me a relish for knowledge and duty, not by forcing my will, but by my own desire, and to train my mind in all freedom and indulgence, without rigour or constraint. He carried out this idea so religiously that, because some hold that it disturbs the tender brains of children to wake them in the morning with a start, and to drag them suddenly and violently out of their sleep (in which they are much more deeply plunged than we are), he had me awakened by the sound of some instrument ; and he was never without a man ^ for this purpose.

This example may sufficiently enable one to judge of the rest, and to bring into favourable notice the wisdom and affection of so good a father, who is by no means to be blamed if he did not gather any fruit corresponding to so excellent a culture. Two things were the cause of this ; firstly, the sterile and unsuitable soil ; for, though of a sound and healthy constitution and at the same time of a gentle and tractable nature, I was withal so heavy, soft, and slug-

gish, that they could not shake me out of my sloth, not even to get me out to play. What I saw, I saw plainly, and beneath this heavy constitution nourished some bold ideas and opinions in advance of my age. I had a slow wit that would go no farther than it was led, a tardy apprehension, a weak initiative, and, with it all, an incredible defect of memory. It is no wonder then that he could extract nothing good from all this.

Secondly, like those who, impelled by a frantic desire to be cured, follow any kind of advice, the good man, in his extreme fear of failing in a matter he had so much at heart, suffered himself at last to be overborne by the prevailing opinion, which always, like the cranes, follows a leader, and fell in with custom. Being no longer in touch with those who had given him those first ideas that he had brought from Italy, he sent me, at about six years of age, to the College de Guienne, which was very flourishing at that time, and the best school in France. And there he took every possible care, both in choosing competent tutors and in all matters appertaining to my bringing-up, at the same time reserving several particular privileges contrary to school usage. Not but that it was still a school. My Latin forthwith grew corrupt, of which I afterwards, through want of practice, lost the entire use. And that novel education of mine was only of service to me in that it enabled me at the outset to jump the first forms ; for, at the age of thirteen, when I left college I had finished my course (as they call it), and in truth without any gain that I could at present put to my account.

^ The first edition had : ' a man who played the spinet

The first relish I had for books came to me from the pleasure I had in the fables of Ovid's Metamorphoses. For at the age of about seven or eight I would steal away from every other pleasure to read them ; seeing that the language was my mother-tongue and the book the easiest I knew, and, by reason of the subject, the most suited to my tender age. For of the Lancelots of the Lake, of the Amadis', and the Huons of Bordeaux and such rubbishy books on which boys waste their time, I knew not even the names, as I am still ignorant of their matter : so strict was my discipline ! But I became more negligent in the study of my other prescribed lessons.

And well did it fall out to my purpose that I had to deal with a tutor who was a man of good sense, who could cleverly connive at this and similar irregularities. For thereby I was able, without a stop, to run through Virgil's

Aeneid, and then Terence, and then Plautus, as well as some Italian comedies, always allured by the attractiveness of the subject. If he had been so foolish as to cross this course, I imagine that I should only have left college with a hatred of books, as do nearly all our nobles. Herein he behaved with iugenuity. Pretending to see nothing of what I was doing, he whetted my appetite by letting me devour those books in secret and at the same time insensibly kept me in humour for the other and regular studies. For the chief qualities that my father sought in those who were given charge of me, were a complaisant and easy-going disposition. And my disposition had no other vices but languor and laziness. The danger was not that I should do S, but that I should do nothing. Nobody predicted that I might become wicked, but only useless ; they foresaw a do-nothing nature, but not a bad nature.

I am sensible that matters have turned out as predicted. The complaints that make my ears tingle are these ; ' Idle, cool in the offices of friendship and kins hip, and in public functions ; too reserved.' Even the most offensive say, not, ' Why has he taken ? why has he not paid ? ' but, ' Why does he not let go ? why does he not give ? '

I should take it as a favour that men should expect of me only such works of supererogation. But they are unjust to exact of me what I do not owe, much more rigorously than they exact of themselves what they do owe. By that demand they deny the gratuitous character of the action, and so they deny me the gratitude that should be my due : whereas my active well-doing should be the more appreciated in consideration of the fact that I have never been the recipient of any beneficence. I may the more freely dispose of my fortune the more it is my own. However, iS. I were a great blazoner of my actions, I might peradventure repel these reproaches, and inform some, that they are not so much offended that I do not do enough, as that I am able to do a great deal more than I do.

At the same time my mind none the less, when left to itself, was not wanting in correct impressions, &m and broad opinions about those things it was able to comprehend, and could digest them without any help. And, among other things, I believe indeed that it was wholly incapable of yielding to force and violence.

Shall I put to my credit this faculty of my boyhood : an assurance of countenance and a fiexibility of voice and gesture in acting the parts I undertook ? For, in advance of my age,

The twelfth year's kiss had scarce yet touched my brow, (Virgil.)

I sustained the leading parts in the Latin tragedies of Buchanan, Guerente, and Muret, which were worthily performed in our college of Guienne.

In this matter of dramatic performances Andreas Go-veanus, our principal, was, as in all other matters appertaining to his charge, without comparison the greatest principal in France ; and I was considered therein a master-worker. It is a practice which I do not disapprove in young boys of good family, and I have since seen our princes honourably and commendably taking an active part therem, after the example of some of the ancients.

In Greece it was permissible even in men of quality to make a profession of it : He disclosed his 'plan to the tragic actor Aristo. This was a man distinguished both by birth and fortune ; nor did his art prejudice him^ for it was not considered any disgrace in Greece (Livy).

For I have always taxed with want of judgement those who condemn these recreations, and with injustice those who refuse to admit into our good towms those comedians who are worth seeing, and begrudge the people these pubho pleasures. Well-governed corporations take care to assemble and unite the citizens, not only for serious and devotional offices, but also for plays and sports ; sociability and friendship are thereby increased. One could not besides concede to them more orderly pastimes than those which take place in presence of all, and even under the eyes of the authorities. And I should think it only right that the magistracy and the prince should from time to time gratify the community with such spectacles at their own expense, out of a sort of paternal goodness and affection ; and that in populous towns there might be places intended and arranged for these shows, as some diversion from worse and secret actions.

To return to my subject, there is nothing like alluring the appetite and affections : else we shall produce only asses laden with books. With the whip we give them their pocketful of learning to keep, which, to do any good, we should not only harbour within us, but espouse.

=====

CHRISTIANITY AND WAR

HARRY EMERSON FOSDICK, D.D.

PARK AVENUE BAPTIST CHURCH, NEW YORK CITY

from *Best Sermons of 1926*

All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword.
Matthew 26:52.

One ought to read with awe these words spoken nearly two thousand years ago and only now beginning to seem obviously true. Reliance on violence is suicidal, said Jesus. When the Master said that, it could not possibly have seemed to be true. Then it seemed evident that those who took the sword and knew how to use it could rule the world. Reliance on violence did not seem suicidal but necessary, salutary, and rich in its rewards. In these words of Jesus we have one of those surprising insights where, far ahead of the event, a seer perceives an obscure truth which only long afterward will emerge clear, unmistakable, imperative, so that all men must believe it.

Pythagoras in the sixth century b.c. had such a flare of insight when he guessed that the sun did not go about the earth but that the earth circled about a central fire. It was a surprising leap of intuition. No one believed it. Long centuries had to pass before Copernicus and Galileo came and people in general were convinced of what Pythagoras with his inner eye had seen. So when the Master said that the sword would destroy those who used it, that seemed incredible. War suicidal! The world did not even note this strange thing that He said, and ever since men have tried to explain it away or laugh it off as idealism too lofty for this earth. But today that insight of the Master comes to its own. Once more the seer is justified of his vision. Reliance on violence is self-defeating; war is suicidal; civilization itself cannot survive it. That fact has been written in fire across the world until not seers alone, but multitudes of plain people of every tongue, tribe, and nation under heaven are beginning to see the truth once so incredible -- "If mankind does not end war, war will end mankind."

Today my plea is simple and direct. Of all the people on earth who ought to take in earnest this unforeseeable confirmation of the Master's insight,

Christians come first. This question of war and its denial of the method and spirit of Jesus is peculiarly their business. Speaking from this historic Christian pulpit to Christians of many races and nations gathered here, one finds himself inevitably concerned with that matter -- addressing, as it were, the conscience of Christendom about war. The destinies of humankind depend upon the arousing of that conscience. Here in Geneva you once more are setting your minds to the high task of working out the technique of international cooperation. In this sanctuary we set ourselves this morning to consider the dynamic without which all technique will fail -- the conscience of Christians about war.

Doubtless we represent here many different kinds of Christianity. We belong to different Churches, hold various theories about ecclesiastical polity, subscribe to diverse creeds. But one thing does unite us all. We all start with and include the Master Himself. To all of us He is the Lord and His way is the way of life. At the fountainhead of our Christianity is Jesus Christ. His life with the Father, His faith in the moral possibilities of man, His devotion to the Kingdom of Heaven on earth. His Good Samaritan, His Golden Rule, His Sermon on the Mount, His law of finding life by losing it. His insight into the self-defeating nature of violence, and His substitution of the way of love -- all this is included in any special kind of Christianity we severally may profess. How, then, can any of us avoid the conviction that this colossal and ominous question of war, upon the answer to which the future of man depends, is in particular a crucial affair for Christianity? It has been said again and again that if another war befalls us and shakes civilization to its foundations, as it surely would, the Christians of the world will be to blame. Surely that is true. The continuance of war will advertise that the 576,000,000 professed Christians on earth have not had an earnest conscience about their Master's view of life ; it will bear evidence that while they have called Him, "Lord, Lord," they have not been willing to do what He said.

Let us dwell, then, on some elements that ought to enter into the operation of the conscience of Christians about war.

For one thing, there is plainly the futility of war

to achieve any of the purposes that Christianity is meant to serve. Indeed, there is modern war's futility to achieve any good purposes whatever. Once it was possible really to win a war. Once victors and vanquished stood in such opposite categories at a war's conclusion that there was no possibility of mistaking the prestige, prosperity, increased power and happiness of the one and the dismal annihilation of the other, but one shocking revelation of the last war was the indiscriminate ruin in which war plunged victor, vanquished, and neutrals alike, the ferocious and untamable way in which war, once let loose, tore at the garments of civilization as a whole so that, regardless of who won it, half the world found itself unclad and shivering when the storm was over.

In the history of war we have one more example of a mode of social action possibly possessing at the beginning more of good than evil, which has outgrown its good, accentuated its evil, and become at last an intolerable thing.

That was true of slavery. Men at first reduced to slavery those whom else they would have slaughtered after battle. Slavery was a substitute for massacre, profitable, doubtless, but also merciful. It was a forward step from brutal murder to enforced labor. But slavery did not retain its philanthropic good. In the end it outgrew all its benefit and became an intolerable curse. In an evolutionary world ethics and modes of social action evolve also.

So there may have been times when war could serve good ends, when armed conflict was a means of social progress. Of this war or that it may be claimed that the sword won benefactions lacking which mankind would be the poorer. At least, there is little use in arguing the contrary. For the conviction now growing strong in this generation's mind is that whatever may have been true about war in times past, modern war is futile to achieve any good or Christian thing.

To fight with the gigantic paraphernalia of modern science; to make war in our intimately inter-related and delicately balanced modern world, where our most indispensable means of existence already have become international; to fight, not with armies against armies as of old, but with entire populations

massed against entire populations so that bombs rain indiscriminate destruction on whole cities and blockades mean indiscriminate starvation to millions of families; to make war now, when an average five hours of fighting, as in the last war, burns up the endowment of a great university; to fight, knowing that, agreements or no agreements to limit the weapons of war, demonic forces like gas and bacteria are certain to be used -- that is obviously futile to achieve any good thing for which a Christian man might wish or pray.

The old appeals for war in the name of a good cause fall coldly now on the instructed ear and cease to carry conviction to thoughtful minds. "Would you not go to war to protect the weak?" men ask. The answer seems obvious. A modern war to protect the weak -- that is a grim jest. See how modern war protects the weak; 10,000,000 known dead soldiers; 3,000,000 presumed dead soldiers; 13,000,000 dead civilians; 20,000,000 wounded; 3,000,000 prisoners; 9,000,000 war orphans; 5,000,000 war widows; 10,000,000 refugees. What can we mean -- modern war protecting the weak? The conviction grows clear in increasing multitudes of minds that modern war is no way to protect the weak.

A World Court would protect the weak. A League of Nations would protect the weak. An international mind, backed by a Christian conscience, that would stop the race for armaments, provide cooperative substitutes for violence, forbid the nations to resort to force, and finally outlaw war altogether -- that would protect the weak. But this is clear: war will not do it. It is the weak by millions who perish in every modern war.

As for Christianity, the dilemma which it faces in all this seems unmistakable. The war system as a recognized method of international action is one thing; Christianity with all its purposes and hopes is another; and not all the dialectic of the apologists can make the two lie down in peace together. We may have one or we may have the other, but we cannot permanently have both.

Another stake which Christianity has in this task of overpassing war and providing international substitutes for it lies in the new and ominous develop-

ments of nationalism. In our modern world nationalism, with its attendant patriotic emotions and loyalties, has increasingly taken a form which threatens to be the chief rival of Christianity. To be sure, passionate love of country is nothing modern or new. Its roots are deep in man's instincts and man's history. We here today are patriots. We intend to be patriots. We should think less of each other if we were not patriots. Love of fatherland is one of the oldest, deepest, most instinctive and most noble sentiments of man.

But within the last four hundred years nationalism has taken a new and startling form in our Western world. With the England of Elizabeth, the France of Louis XI, the Russia of Peter the Great, the development began which more and more has nationalized both the inner and the outer life of all of us. Our politics have become nationalized until the aggrandizement of one's own country in the competitive struggle with other nationalities has been the supreme aim of statesmanship. Our economic life has become nationalized; the powerful financial interests of each nation have wielded so enormous an influence over its statecraft that government, with its army and navy to back it, has frequently been a docile instrument for the furtherance of the country's economic aims. Our education has become nationalized; our children have been taught from infancy history all out of perspective, with national egoism for its organizing center and with hatred of other nations masquerading as patriotic training of the young. Even our religion has been nationalized; with state churches or without them, the center of loyalty in the religious life of the people has increasingly become the nation. Let Protestantism acknowledge its large responsibility for this in Western Christendom! In our fight for liberty we broke up the inclusive mother church into national churches; we reorganized the worship of the people around nationalistic ideals; we helped to identify religion and patriotism. And so far has that identification gone that now, when war breaks, the one God of all humanity, whom Christ came to reveal, is split up into little tribal deities, and before these pagan idols even Christians pray for the blood of their enemies.

Never before has human life, its statecraft, its economics, its education, its religion, on so large a scale been organized on a nationalistic basis, and the

issue is obvious. The supreme object of devotion for multitudes is the nation. In practical action they know no higher God. They really worship Caesar. That is the limit of their loyalty. What once was said of the king is said now of the nation; it can do no wrong. And such sheer paganism is sometimes openly flaunted, at least in my country, and I presume in yours, as "Our country! . . . may she always be in the right; but our country, right or wrong."

Nevertheless, at the same time that this nationalistic process has been going on, another movement has been gathering headway. The enlarging fellowship of human life upon this planet, which began with the clan and tribe and has moved out through ever-widening circles of communication and contact, has now become explicitly and overwhelmingly international, and it never can be crowded back again. Moreover, within this unescapable internationalism of modern life, not yet adequately recognized in government, mankind has been learning one great lesson from his social experiments. In area after area he has succeeded in getting what he wanted, not by violence, but by overpassing violence and substituting cooperation. That is what social progress consists in. All social progress can be defined as carrying over one more realm of human life from the regime of force to the regime of cooperation. Wherever we have civilized any social group, the essential thing which has happened is that in that group, not force, but cooperation has become the arbiter.

That is true of the family. A household where men captured their wives, exposed their children in infancy, relied for obedience on the power of life and death over their offspring, would be recognizably uncivilized. A civilized family, with all its faults, enters into marriage by mutual consent, relies on reasonableness, not on force, for its coherence, and from the beginning welcomes children into the democracy of the household. At least we have learned that violence is no way to bring up a good family. That same path of progress we have traveled in education. Once violence ruled our schools. It was said of an old pedagogue, the Rev. James Boyer, that "it was lucky the cherubim who took him to heaven were nothing but wings and faces or he infallibly would have flogged them by the way." But now our

schools at their best would be ashamed to rely on violence since reasonableness and cooperation so plainly offer, not only a more ideal, but a more effective substitute. In religion also, being civilized means traveling that road from violence to cooperation. Once force was used to compel faith. If a man wished to be a Christian he could be a Christian, but if he did not wish to be a Christian he had to be a Christian, and the centuries are sad with the horrors of religious persecution. But social progress has largely left all that behind and what compelled its supersession was not sentimentality but the insight that violence is self-defeating, that force is no way to get religion. So, too, has government been carried over from violence to cooperation. The process is lamentably incomplete, but, so far as it has gone, it has furnished the indispensable background for all the civilization we possess. Still upon our Western clothes we wear the buttons, now decorative only, on which once our fathers' swordbelts hung. How impossible it would have seemed to them that the time would ever come when the common carrying of private weapons would be unnecessary because cooperative and peaceful government had provided a substitute!

I In one realm after another the Master's insight >has proved true. Violence defeats itself. It is no way to achieve family life or education or religion or 'stable government. Those who rely on it as their "mainstay and effective instrument are sure to miss what they are seeking to achieve. Always progress >has consisted in carrying over human life from violence to cooperation.

^ And now we face the next great step, the most momentous step in human history. Can we achieve a like result with our international relationships? |Can we carry them over from brutality and organized slaughter to reasonableness and cooperation? How the best thinking and praying of our time center -around that hope of superseding belligerent nationalism with cooperative international substitutes for war!

Here, then, we face one of the most crucial and dramatic conflicts of loyalty that men ever dealt with. 'On the one side, our life has been organized as never before in history on a nationalistic basis. On the (other hand, the one hope of humanity today, if it is

to escape devastating ruin, lies in rising above and beyond this nationalism and organizing the world for peace. On the one side is a narrow patriotism saying, "My country against yours," on the other, a wider patriotism saying, "My country with yours for the peace of mankind." Is there any question where real Christianity must stand in that conflict? Is there any question that if she does not stand there she faces the most tragic and colossal moral failure of her history? One would like to cry so that all Christians should hear: Followers of Christ, so often straining out the gnat and swallowing the camel, tithing mint, anise, and cummin, and neglecting the weightier matters of the law, what do all the minutiae of creed and institution that distinguish us amount to in the presence of this gigantic problem in which one of the central meanings of Christ for the world is involved? A narrow belligerent nationalism is today the most explicit and thoroughgoing denial of Christianity, its thought of God and its love of man, that there is on earth.

How evident this central problem is when we try to discuss the real issues of the world today ! Some still see those issues in terms of one nation against another. That is the level on which their thinking runs. America versus Japan or France versus Germany -- so in a long list of nation against nation they see the world's affairs. How desperately real the problems are on that level no one needs to be told, but, after all, those are not the deepest issues. A clear conviction grows in the best thinking of today that mankind's realest conflict of interest is not between this nation and that, but between the forward-looking, progressive, open-minded people of all nations, who have caught a vision of humanity organized for peace, and the backward-looking, reactionary, militaristic people of the same nations. The deepest line of conflict does not run vertically between the nations; it runs horizontally through all the nations. The salvation of humanity from self-destruction depends on which side of that conflict wins.

What has happened thus to make a local, national patriotism, however sacred and beautiful in many of its forms, inadequate to meet our present need is clear. In unforgettable words the world has been told by a great patriot: "Patriotism is not enough." Why is it not enough? Well, patriotism once took

men of little, local loyalties and expanded their outlook and allegiance. They had been citizens of a shire; patriotism made them citizens of a nation. Patriotism once called men to the widest imaginable outreach of their devotion; it broke down local provincialisms; it stretched human horizons; it demanded unaccustomed breadth of vision and unselfishness of life. To be a patriot for the nation meant a large loyalty as against the meanness and parochialism of a local mind. But the world has moved. Life has expanded and become international. Now it is possible for patriotism to fall from its high estate. Instead of calling men to wider horizons, it can keep them within narrow ones. Once the issue was patriotism versus a small parochialism; now the question may become patriotism versus a large care for humanity. Once patriotism was the great enemy of provincialism; now it can be made to mean provincialism and to sanctify the narrow mind.

This conflict of loyalties creates your difficult problems here in Geneva. You know how tenacious the adhesions of nationalism are, how difficult to entwine the thoughts and affections of men around new ideals and new methods of world peace. But this inner struggle between two loyalties goes deeper than the realm of statesmanship; it runs far down into the souls of men where the destinies of religion lie. How can a man be a follower of Jesus Christ and still be a belligerent nationalist, when once this better hope of a world organized for peace has dawned upon his view? Whatever else Christianity may believe in, it must believe in God, Father of all men; it must believe in men of every tribe, tongue, people, and nation, as God's children; it must believe in the Kingdom of God on earth. The spirit of Christianity is not narrowly nationalistic, but universally inclusive. When the world, therefore, organizes itself on the basis of belligerent nationalism the very genius of the Christian Gospel is at stake. Once more we can have our old war systems with their appalling modern developments, or we can have Christianity, but we cannot permanently have both. They worship irreconcilable gods.

I need not, and I must not, press the analysis further. Two generations ago one of our great statesmen, Charles Sumner, said, "Not that I love country less, but Humanity more, do I now and here plead the cause of a higher and truer patriotism. I can-

not forget that we are men by a more sacred bond than we are citizens -- that we are children of a common Father more than we are Americans." Shall not each one of us here pray for his own country, as I pray earnestly for mine, that that spirit may come into the ascendancy? Christianity essentially involves it.

The first Christians saw this. "The early Christian Church," says a recent writer, "was the first peace society." Then came Christianity's growing power -- the days when Christians, no longer outcast, were stronger than their adversaries, until at last the imperial household of Constantine himself accepted Christianity. Then Christianity, joined with the state, forgot its earlier attitudes, bowed to the necessities of imperial action, became sponsor for war, blessing of war, cause of war, fighter of war. Since then the Church has come down through history too often trying to carry the cross of Jesus in one hand and a dripping sword in the other, until now when Christians look out upon the consequence of it all, this abysmal disgrace of Christendom making mockery of the Gospel, the conviction rises that we would better go back to our first traditions, our early purity, and see whether those first disciples of the Lord were not nearer right than we have been.

We cannot reconcile Jesus Christ and war -- that is the essence of the matter. That is the challenge which today should stir the conscience of Christendom. War is the most colossal and ruinous social sin that afflicts mankind; it is utterly and irremediably unchristian; in its total method and effect it means everything that Jesus did not mean and it means nothing that He did mean ; it is a more blatant denial of every Christian doctrine about God and man than all the theoretical atheists on earth ever could devise. It would be worth while, would it not, to see the Christian Church claim as her own this greatest moral issue of our time, to see her lift once more, as in our fathers' days, a clear standard against the paganism of this present world and, refusing to hold her conscience at the beck and call of belligerent states, put the Kingdom of God above nationalism and call the world to peace? That would not be the denial of patriotism but its apotheosis.

Here today, as an American, under this high and hospitable roof, I cannot speak for my government,

but both as an American and as a Christian I do speak for millions of my fellow citizens in wishing your great work, in which we believe, for which we pray, our absence from which we painfully regret, the eminent success which it deserves. We work in many ways for the same end -- a world organized for peace. Never was an end better worth working for. The alternative is the most appalling catastrophe mankind has ever faced. Like gravitation in the physical realm, the law of the Lord in the moral realm bends for no man and no nation; "All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword."

=====

All will agree that a sermon pleading for a Christian Conscience About War, delivered in the Cathedral at Geneva, at the League of Nations Assembly Service, ought to have first place in any book. The occasion, the preacher and the theme made it memorable, alike for the opportunity and the magnificent manner in which the preacher met it -- himself a "heretic," denouncing war as the supreme social heresy of civilization. Never did the challenging words of Jesus have a more picturesque and poignant setting.

A sketch of Dr. Fosdick appeared in *Best Sermons 1924*; since that time he has been offered fellowship in the Presbyterian Church and declined it, accepting, instead, the pastorate of the Park Avenue Baptist Church of New York City -- which will no doubt again change its name when it moves to its new home on Riverside Drive. Besides, he has written two very brilliant books, *Twelve Tests of Character*, in which we see the practical spiritual philosopher dealing with the stuff of life and how it may be shaped for use and beauty; and *The Modern Use of the Bible*, being the Yale Lectures of Preaching for 1925 -- a book encouraging or disappointing, according to the point of view of the reader. He also conducts a regular department, discussing Religion and Life, in Harper's Magazine,

As the clouds of controversy are lifted, men of all faiths will the more rejoice in a ministry so extraordinarily influential in behalf of the best things -- popular but never cheap, at once stimulating and challenging; and its further unfoldment will be followed with gratitude and joy.

bio from *Best Sermons of 1926*

Edited with Introduction and Biographical Notes by
Joseph Fort Newton

=====

THE STRUGGLE FOR EXISTENCE.

The Project Gutenberg eBook of *Darwinism*
stated by Darwin himself, by Charles Darwin

[*Origin of Species*,
page 50.]

A struggle for existence inevitably follows from the high rate at which all organic beings tend to increase. Every being, which during its natural lifetime produces several eggs or seeds, must suffer destruction during some period of its life, and during some season or occasional year, otherwise, on the principle of geometrical increase, its numbers would quickly become so inordinately great that no country could support the product. Hence, as more individuals are produced than can possibly survive, there must in every case be a struggle for existence, either one individual with another of the same species, or with the individuals of distinct species, or with the physical conditions of life. It is the doctrine of Malthus applied with manifold force to the whole animal and vegetable kingdoms; for in this case there can be no artificial increase of food, and no prudential restraint from marriage. Although some species may be now increasing, more or less rapidly, in numbers, all can not do so, for the world would not hold them.

There is no exception to the rule that every organic being naturally increases at so high a rate, that, if not destroyed, the earth would soon be covered with the progeny of a single pair. Even slow-breeding man has doubled in twenty-five years, and at this rate, in less than a thousand years, there would literally not be standing-room for his progeny. Linnæus has calculated that if an annual plant produced only two seeds--and there is no plant so unproductive as this--and their seedlings next year produced two, and so on, then in twenty years there would be a million plants. The elephant is reckoned the slowest breeder of all known animals, and I have taken some pains to estimate its probable minimum rate of natural increase; it will be safest to assume that it begins breeding when thirty years old, and goes on breeding till ninety years old, bringing forth six young in the interval, and surviving till one hundred years old; if this be so, after a period of from seven hundred and forty to seven hundred and fifty years, there would be nearly nineteen million elephants alive, descended from the first pair.

DEATH INEVITABLE IN THE FIGHT FOR LIFE.

[Page 52.]

In a state of nature almost every full-grown plant annually produces seed, and among animals there are very few which do not annually pair. Hence we may confidently assert that all plants and animals are tending to increase at a geometrical ratio, that all would rapidly stock every station in which they could anyhow exist, and that this geometrical tendency to increase must be checked by destruction at some period of life. Our familiarity with the larger domestic animals tends, I think, to mislead us: we see no great destruction falling on them, but we do not keep in mind that thousands are annually slaughtered for food, and that in a state of nature an equal number would have somehow to be disposed of.

The only difference between organisms which annually produce eggs or seeds by the thousand and those which produce extremely few is, that the slow breeders would require a few more years to people, under favorable conditions, a whole district, let it be ever so large. The condor lays a couple of eggs and the ostrich a score, and yet in the same country the condor may be the more numerous of the two; the Fulmar petrel lays but one egg, yet it is believed to be the most numerous bird in the world. One fly deposits hundreds of eggs, and another, like the *Hippobosca*, a single one; but this difference does not determine how many individuals of the two species can be supported in a district. A large number of eggs is of some importance to those species which depend on a fluctuating amount of food, for it allows them rapidly to increase in number. But the real importance of a large number of eggs or seeds is to make up for much destruction at some period of life; and this period in the great majority of cases is an early one. If an animal can in any way protect its own eggs or young, a small number may be produced, and yet the average stock be fully kept up; but, if many eggs or young are destroyed, many must be produced, or the species will become extinct. It would suffice to keep up the full number of a tree, which lived on an average for a thousand years, if a single seed were produced once in a thousand years, supposing that this seed were never destroyed, and could be insured to germinate in a fitting place. So that, in all cases, the average number of any animal or plant depends only indirectly on the number of its eggs or seeds.

In looking at Nature, it is most necessary to keep the foregoing considerations always in mind--never to forget that every single organic being may be said to be striving to the utmost to increase in numbers; that each lives by a struggle at some period of its life; that heavy destruction inevitably falls either on the young or old during each generation or at recurrent intervals. Lighten any check, mitigate the destruction ever so little, and the number of the species will almost instantaneously increase to any amount.

“INEXPLICABLE ON THE THEORY OF CREATION.”

[Origin of
Species,
page 413.]

As each species tends by its geometrical rate of reproduction to increase inordinately in number, and as the modified descendants of each species will be enabled to increase by as much as they become more diversified in habits and structure, so as to be able to seize on many and widely different places in the economy of nature, there will be a constant tendency in natural selection to preserve the most divergent offspring of any one species. Hence, during a long-continued course of modification, the slight differences characteristic of varieties of the same species tend to be augmented into the greater differences characteristic of the species of the same genus. New and improved varieties will inevitably supplant and exterminate the older, less improved, and intermediate varieties; and thus species are rendered to a large extent defined and distinct objects. Dominant species belonging to the larger groups within each class tend to give birth to new and dominant forms; so that each large group tends to become still larger, and at the same time more divergent in character. But, as all groups can not thus go on increasing in size, for the world would not hold them, the more dominant groups beat the less dominant. This tendency in the large groups to go on increasing in size and diverging in character, together with the inevitable contingency of much extinction, explains the arrangement of all the forms of life in groups subordinate to groups, all within a few great classes, which has prevailed throughout all time. This grand fact of the grouping of all organic beings under what is called the Natural System is utterly inexplicable on the theory of creation.

OBSURE CHECKS TO INCREASE.

[Origin of
Species,
page 53.]

The causes which check the natural tendency of each species to increase are most obscure. Look at the most vigorous species; by as much as it swarms in numbers, by so much will it tend to increase still further. We know not exactly what the checks are even in a single instance. Nor will this surprise any one who reflects how ignorant we are on this head, even in regard to mankind, although so incomparably better known than any other animal.

* * * * *

Eggs or very young animals seem generally to suffer most, but this is not invariably the case. With plants there is a vast destruction of

seeds, but, from some observations which I have made it appears that the seedlings suffer most from germinating in ground already thickly stocked with other plants. Seedlings, also, are destroyed in vast numbers by various enemies; for instance, on a piece of ground three feet long and two wide, dug and cleared, and where there could be no choking from other plants, I marked all the seedlings of our native weeds as they came up, and out of 357 no less than 295 were destroyed, chiefly by slugs and insects. If turf which has long been mown, and the case would be the same with turf closely browsed by quadrupeds, be let to grow, the more vigorous plants gradually kill the less vigorous, though fully grown plants; thus out of twenty species growing on a little plot of mown turf (three feet by four) nine species perished, from the other species being allowed to grow up freely.

The amount of food for each species, of course, gives the extreme limit to which each can increase; but very frequently it is not the obtaining food, but the serving as prey to other animals, which determines the average number of a species. Thus, there seems to be little doubt that the stock of partridges, grouse, and hares on any large estate depends chiefly on the destruction of vermin. If not one head of game were shot during the next twenty years in England, and, at the same time, if no vermin were destroyed, there would, in all probability, be less game than at present, although hundreds of thousands of game animals are now annually shot. On the other hand, in some cases, as with the elephant, none are destroyed by beasts of prey; for even the tiger in India most rarely dares to attack a young elephant protected by its dam.

CLIMATE AS A CHECK TO INCREASE.

[Page 54.]

Climate plays an important part in determining the average numbers of a species, and periodical seasons of extreme cold or drought seem to be the most effective of all checks. I estimated (chiefly from the greatly reduced numbers of nests in the spring) that the winter of 1854-'55 destroyed four fifths of the birds in my own grounds; and this is a tremendous destruction, when we remember that ten per cent is an extraordinarily severe mortality from epidemics with man. The action of climate seems at first sight to be quite independent of the struggle for existence; but, in so far as climate chiefly acts in reducing food, it brings on the most severe struggle between the individuals, whether of the same or of distinct species, which subsist on the same kind of food. Even when climate--for instance, extreme cold--acts directly, it will be the least vigorous individuals, or those which have got least food through the advancing winter, which will suffer most. When we travel from south to north, or from a damp region to a dry, we invariably see some species gradually getting rarer and rarer, and finally disappearing; and, the change of climate being conspicuous, we are tempted to attribute the whole effect to its direct action. But

this is a false view: we forget that each species, even where it most abounds, is constantly suffering enormous destruction at some period of its life, from enemies or from competitors for the same place and food; and, if these enemies or competitors be in the least degree favored by any slight change of climate, they will increase in numbers; and, as each area is already fully stocked with inhabitants, the other species must decrease. When we travel southward and see a species decreasing in numbers, we may feel sure that the cause lies quite as much in other species being favored as in this one being hurt. So it is when we travel northward, but in a somewhat lesser degree, for the number of species of all kinds, and therefore of competitors, decreases northward; hence, in going northward, or in ascending a mountain, we far oftener meet with stunted forms, due to the directly injurious action of climate, than we do in proceeding southward or in descending a mountain. When we reach the Arctic regions, or snow-capped summits, or absolute deserts, the struggle for life is almost exclusively with the elements.

INFLUENCE OF INSECTS IN THE STRUGGLE FOR EXISTENCE.

[Page 56.]

In several parts of the world insects determine the existence of cattle. Perhaps Paraguay offers the most curious instance of this; for here neither cattle nor horses nor dogs have ever run wild, though they swarm southward and northward in a feral state; and Azara and Rengger have shown that this is caused by the greater number in Paraguay of a certain fly, which lays its eggs in the navels of these animals when first born. The increase of these flies, numerous as they are, must be habitually checked by some means, probably by other parasitic insects. Hence, if certain insectivorous birds were to decrease in Paraguay, the parasitic insects would probably increase; and this would lessen the number of the navel-frequenting flies; then cattle and horses would become feral, and this would certainly greatly alter (as indeed I have observed in parts of South America) the vegetation: this again would largely affect the insects, and this, as we have just seen in Staffordshire, the insectivorous birds, and so onward in ever-increasing circles of complexity. Not that under nature the relations will ever be as simple as this. Battle within battle must be continually recurring with varying success; and yet in the long run the forces are so nicely balanced that the face of Nature remains for long periods of time uniform, though assuredly the merest trifle would give the victory to one organic being over another. Nevertheless, so profound is our ignorance, and so high our presumption, that we marvel when we hear of the extinction of an organic being; and, as we do not see the cause, we invoke cataclysms to desolate the world, or invent laws on the duration of the forms of life!

* * * * *

[Page 57.]

Nearly all our orchidaceous plants absolutely require the visits of insects to remove their pollen-masses and thus to fertilize them. I find from experiments that humble-bees are almost indispensable to the fertilization of the heart's-ease (*Viola tricolor*), for other bees do not visit this flower. I have also found that the visits of bees are necessary for the fertilization of some kinds of clover: for instance, 20 heads of Dutch clover (*Trifolium repens*) yielded 2,290 seeds, but 20 other heads protected from bees produced not one. Again, 100 heads of red clover (*T. pratense*) produced 2,700 seeds, but the same number of protected heads produced not a single seed. Humble-bees alone visit red clover, as other bees can not reach the nectar. It has been suggested that moths may fertilize the clovers; but I doubt whether they could do so in the case of the red clover, from their weight not being sufficient to depress the wing-petals. Hence we may infer as highly probable that, if the whole genus of humble-bees became extinct or very rare in England, the heart's-ease and red clover would become very rare, or wholly disappear. The number of humble-bees in any district depends in a great measure on the number of field-mice, which destroy their combs and nests; and Colonel Newman, who has long attended to the habits of humble-bees, believes that "more than two thirds of them are thus destroyed all over England." Now, the number of mice is largely dependent, as every one knows, on the number of cats; and Colonel Newman says, "Near villages and small towns I have found the nests of humble-bees more numerous than elsewhere, which I attribute to the number of cats that destroy the mice." Hence it is quite credible that the presence of a feline animal in large numbers in a district might determine, through the intervention first of mice and then of bees, the frequency of certain flowers in that district!

NO SUCH THING AS CHANCE IN THE RESULT OF THE STRUGGLE.

[Page 58.]

When we look at the plants and bushes clothing an entangled bank, we are tempted to attribute their proportional numbers and kinds to what we call chance. But how false a view is this! Every one has heard that, when an American forest is cut down, a very different vegetation springs up; but it has been observed that ancient Indian ruins in the Southern United States, which must formerly have been cleared of trees, now display the same beautiful diversity and proportion of kinds as in the surrounding virgin forest. What a struggle must have gone on during long centuries between the several kinds of trees, each annually scattering its seeds by the thousand; what war between insect and insect--between insects, snails, and other animals with birds and beasts of prey--all striving to increase, all feeding on each other, or on the trees, their seeds and seedlings, or on the other plants which

first clothed the ground and thus checked the growth of the trees!
Throw up a handful of feathers, and all fall to the ground according
to definite laws; but how simple is the problem where each shall fall
compared to that of the action and reaction of the innumerable plants
and animals which have determined, in the course of centuries, the
proportional numbers and kinds of trees now growing on the old Indian
ruins!

* * * * *

[Page 61.]

It is good thus to try in imagination to give to any one species an
advantage over another. Probably in no single instance should we know
what to do. This ought to convince us of our ignorance on the mutual
relations of all organic beings--a conviction as necessary as it is
difficult to acquire. All that we can do is to keep steadily in mind
that each organic being is striving to increase in a geometrical ratio;
that each at some period of its life, during some season of the year,
during each generation or at intervals, has to struggle for life and
to suffer great destruction. When we reflect on this struggle, we may
console ourselves with the full belief that the war of nature is not
incessant, that no fear is felt, that death is generally prompt, and
that the vigorous, the healthy, and the happy survive and multiply.

=====
=====

DO ANIMALS THINK AND REFLECT?

The Project Gutenberg EBook of *Ways of Nature*, by John Burroughs

When we see the animals going about, living their lives in many ways
as we live ours, seeking their food, avoiding their enemies, building
their nests, digging their holes, laying up stores, migrating,
courting, playing, fighting, showing cunning, courage, fear, joy,
anger, rivalry, grief, profiting by experience, following their
leaders,--when we see all this, I say, what more natural than that we
should ascribe to them powers akin to our own, and look upon them as
thinking, reasoning, and reflecting. A hasty survey of animal life is
sure to lead to this conclusion. An animal is not a clod, nor a block,
nor a machine. It is alive and self-directing, it has some sort of
psychic life, yet the more I study the subject, the more I am
persuaded that with the probable exception of the dog on occasions,
and of the apes, animals do not think or reflect in any proper sense
of those words. As I have before said, animal life shows in an active
and free state that kind of intelligence that pervades and governs the
whole organic world,--intelligence that takes no thought of itself.
Here, in front of my window, is a black raspberry bush. A few weeks
ago its branches curved upward, with their ends swinging fully two

feet above the ground; now those ends are thrust down through the weeds and are fast rooted to the soil. Did the raspberry bush think, or choose what it should do? Did it reflect and say, Now is the time for me to bend down and thrust my tip into the ground? To all intents and purposes yes, yet there was no voluntary mental process, as in similar acts of our own. We say its nature prompts it to act thus and thus, and that is all the explanation we can give. Or take the case of the pine or the spruce tree that loses its central and leading shoot. When this happens, does the tree start a new bud and then develop a new shoot to take the place of the lost leader? No, a branch from the first ring of branches below, probably the most vigorous of the whorl, is promoted to the leadership. Slowly it rises up, and in two or three years it reaches the upright position and is leading the tree upward. This, I suspect, is just as much an act of conscious intelligence and of reason as is much to which we are so inclined to apply those words in animal life. I suppose it is all foreordained in the economy of the tree, if we could penetrate that economy. It is in this sense that Nature thinks in the animal, and the vegetable, and the mineral worlds. Her thinking is more flexible and adaptive in the vegetable than in the mineral, and more so in the animal than in the vegetable, and the most so of all in the mind of man.

The way the wild apple trees and the red thorn trees in the pasture, as described by Thoreau, triumph over the cattle that year after year browse them down, suggests something almost like human tactics. The cropped and bruised tree, not being allowed to shoot upward, spreads more and more laterally, thus pushing its enemies farther and farther away, till, after many years, a shoot starts up from the top of the thorny, knotted cone, and in one season, protected by this _cheval-de-frise_, attains a height beyond the reach of the cattle, and the victory is won. Now the whole push of the large root system goes into the central shoot and the tree is rapidly developed.

This almost looks like a well-laid scheme on the part of the tree to defeat its enemies. But see how inevitable the whole process is. Check the direct flow of a current and it will flow out at the sides; check the side issues and they will push out on their sides, and so on. So it is with the tree or seedling. The more it is cropped, the more it branches and rebranches, pushing out laterally as its vertical growth is checked, till it has surrounded the central stalk on all sides with a dense, thorny hedge. Then as this stalk is no longer cropped, it leads the tree upward. The lateral branches are starved, and in a few years the tree stands with little or no evidence of the ordeal it has passed through. In like manner the nature of the animals prompts them to the deeds they do, and we think of them as the result of a mental process, because similar acts in ourselves are the result of such a process.

See how the mice begin to press into our buildings as the fall comes on. Do they know winter is coming? In the same way the vegetable world

knows it is coming when it prepares for winter, or the insect world when it makes ready, but not as you and I know it. The woodchuck "holes up" in late September; the crows flock and select their rookery about the same time, and the small wood newts or salamanders soon begin to migrate to the marshes. They all know winter is coming, just as much as the tree knows, when in August it forms its new buds for the next year, or as the flower knows that its color and perfume will attract the insects, and no more. The general intelligence of nature settles all these and similar things.

When a bird selects a site for its nest, it seems, on first view, as if it must actually think, reflect, compare, as you and I do when we decide where to place our house. I saw a little chipping sparrow trying to decide between two raspberry bushes. She kept going from one to the other, peering, inspecting, and apparently weighing the advantages of each. I saw a robin in the woodbine on the side of the house trying to decide which particular place was the best site for her nest. She hopped to this tangle of shoots and sat down, then to that, she turned around, she readjusted herself, she looked about, she worked her feet beneath her, she was slow in making up her mind. Did she make up her mind? Did she think, compare, weigh? I do not believe it. When she found the right conditions, she no doubt felt pleasure and satisfaction, and that settled the question. An inward, instinctive want was met and satisfied by an outward material condition. In the same way the hermit crab goes from shell to shell upon the beach, seeking one to its liking. Sometimes two crabs fall to fighting over a shell that each wants. Can we believe that the hermit crab thinks and reasons? It selects the suitable shell instinctively, and not by an individual act of judgment. Instinct is not always inerrant, though it makes fewer mistakes than reason does. The red squirrel usually knows how to come at the meat in the butternut with the least gnawing, but now and then he makes a mistake and strikes the edge of the kernel, instead of the flat side. The cliff swallow will stick her mud nest under the eaves of a barn where the boards are planed so smooth that the nest sooner or later is bound to fall. She seems to have no judgment in the matter. Her ancestors built upon the face of high cliffs, where the mud adhered more firmly.

A wood thrush began a nest in one of my maples, as usual making the foundation of dry leaves, bits of paper, and dry grass. After the third day the site on the branch was bare, the wind having swept away every vestige of the nest. As I passed beneath the tree I saw the thrush standing where the nest had been, apparently in deep thought. A few days afterward I looked again, and the nest was completed. The bird had got ahead of the wind at last. The nesting-instinct had triumphed over the weather.

Take the case of the little yellow warbler when the cowbird drops her egg into its nest--does anything like a process of thought or reflection pass in the bird's mind then? The warbler is much disturbed

when she discovers the strange egg, and her mate appears to share her agitation. Then after a time, and after the two have apparently considered the matter together, the mother bird proceeds to bury the egg by building another nest on top of the old one. If another cowbird's egg is dropped in this one, she will proceed to get rid of this in the same way. This all looks very like reflection. But let us consider the matter a moment. This thing between the cowbird and the warbler has been going on for innumerable generations. The yellow warbler seems to be the favorite host of this parasite, and something like a special instinct may have grown up in the warbler with reference to this strange egg. The bird reacts, as the psychologists say, at sight of it, then she proceeds to dispose of it in the way above described. _All yellow warblers act in the same manner_, which is the way of instinct. Now if this procedure was the result of an individual thought or calculation on the part of the birds, they would not all do the same thing; different lines of conduct would be hit upon. How much simpler and easier it would be to throw the egg out--how much more like an act of rational intelligence. So far as I know, no bird does eject this parasitical egg, and no other bird besides the yellow warbler gets rid of it in the way I have described. I have found a deserted phoebe's nest with one egg of the phoebe and one of the cowbird in it.

Some of our wild birds have changed their habits of nesting, coming from the woods and the rocks to the protection of our buildings. The phoebe-bird and the cliff swallow are marked examples. We ascribe the change to the birds' intelligence, but to my mind it shows only their natural adaptiveness. Take the cliff swallow, for instance; it has largely left the cliffs for the eaves of our buildings. How naturally and instinctively this change has come about! In an open farming country insect life is much more varied and abundant than in a wild, unsettled country. This greater food supply naturally attracts the swallows. Then the protecting eaves of the buildings would stimulate their nesting-instincts. The abundance of mud along the highways and about the farm would also no doubt have its effect, and the birds would adopt the new sites as a matter of course. Or take the phoebe, which originally built its nest under ledges, and does so still to some extent. It, too, would find a more abundant food supply in the vicinity of farm-buildings and bridges. The protected nesting-sites afforded by sheds and porches would likewise stimulate its nesting-instincts, and attract the bird as we see it attracted each spring.

Nearly everything an animal does is the result of an inborn instinct acted upon by an outward stimulus. The margin wherein intelligent choice plays a part is very small. But it does at times play a part--perceptive intelligence, but not rational intelligence. The insects do many things that look like intelligence, yet how these things differ from human intelligence may be seen in the case of one of our solitary wasps,--the mud-dauber,--which sometimes builds its

cell with great labor, then seals it up without laying its egg and storing it with the accustomed spiders. Intelligence never makes that kind of a mistake, but instinct does. Instinct acts more in the invariable way of a machine. Certain of the solitary wasps bring their game--spider, or bug, or grasshopper--and place it just at the entrance of their hole, and then go into their den apparently to see that all is right before they carry it in.

Fabre, the French naturalist, experimented with one of these wasps, as follows: While the wasp was in its den he moved its grasshopper a few inches away. The wasp came out, brought it to the opening as before, and went within a second time; again the game was removed, again the wasp came out and brought it back and entered her nest as before. This little comedy was repeated over and over; each time the wasp felt compelled to enter her hole before dragging in the grasshopper. She was like a machine that would work that way and no other. Step must follow step in just such order. Any interruption of the regular method and she must begin over again. This is instinct, and the incident shows how widely it differs from conscious intelligence.

If you have a tame chipmunk, turn him loose in an empty room and give him some nuts. Finding no place to hide them, he will doubtless carry them into a corner and pretend to cover them up. You will see his paws move quickly about them for an instant as if in the act of pulling leaves or mould over them. His machine, too, must work in that way. After the nuts have been laid down, the next thing in order is to cover them, and he makes the motions all in due form. Intelligence would have omitted this useless act.

A canary-bird in its cage will go through all the motions of taking a bath in front of the cup that holds its drinking-water when it can only dip its bill into the liquid. The sight or touch of the water excites it and sets it going, and with now and then a drop thrown from its beak it will keep up the flirting and fluttering motion of its tail and wings precisely as if taking a real instead of an imaginary bath.

Attempt to thwart the nesting-instinct in a bird and see how persistent it is, and how blind! One spring a pair of English sparrows tried to build a nest on the plate that upholds the roof of my porch. They were apparently attracted by an opening about an inch wide in the top of the plate, that ran the whole length of it. The pair were busy nearly the whole month of April in carrying nesting-material to various points on that plate. That big crack or opening which was not large enough to admit their bodies seemed to have a powerful fascination for them. They carried straws and weed stalks and filled up one portion of it, and then another and another, till the crack was packed with rubbish from one end of the porch to the other, and the indignant broom of the housekeeper grew tired of sweeping up the litter. The birds could not effect an entrance into the interior of

the plate, but they could thrust in their nesting-material, and so they persisted week after week, stimulated by the presence of a cavity beyond their reach. The case is a good illustration of the blind working of instinct.

Animals have keen perceptions,--keener in many respects than our own,--but they form no conceptions, have no powers of comparing one thing with another. They live entirely in and through their senses.

It is as if the psychic world were divided into two planes, one above the other,--the plane of sense and the plane of spirit. In the plane of sense live the lower animals, only now and then just breaking for a moment into the higher plane. In the world of sense man is immersed also--this is his start and foundation; but he rises into the plane of spirit, and here lives his proper life. He is emancipated from sense in a way that beasts are not.

Thus, I think, the line between animal and human psychology may be pretty clearly drawn. It is not a dead-level line. Instinct is undoubtedly often modified by intelligence, and intelligence is as often guided or prompted by instinct, but one need not hesitate long as to which side of the line any given act of man or beast belongs. When the fox resorts to various tricks to outwit and delay the hound (if he ever consciously does so), he exercises a kind of intelligence,--the lower form which we call cunning,--and he is prompted to this by an instinct of self-preservation. When the birds set up a hue and cry about a hawk or an owl, or boldly attack him, they show intelligence in its simpler form, the intelligence that recognizes its enemies, prompted again by the instinct of self-preservation. When a hawk does not know a man on horseback from a horse, it shows a want of intelligence. When a crow is kept away from a corn-field by a string stretched around it, the fact shows how masterful is its fear and how shallow its wit. When a cat or a dog, or a horse or a cow, learns to open a gate or a door, it shows a degree of intelligence--power to imitate, to profit by experience. A machine could not learn to do this. If the animal were to close the door or gate behind it, that would be another step in intelligence. But its direct wants have no relation to the closing of the door, only to the opening of it. To close the door involves an after-thought that an animal is not capable of. A horse will hesitate to go upon thin ice or upon a frail bridge, even though it has never had any experience with thin ice or frail bridges. This, no doubt, is an inherited instinct, which has arisen in its ancestors from their fund of general experience with the world. How much with them has depended upon a secure footing! A pair of house wrens had a nest in my well-curb; when the young were partly grown and heard any one come to the curb, they would set up a clamorous calling for food. When I scratched against the sides of the curb beneath them like some animal trying to climb up, their voices instantly hushed; the instinct of fear promptly overcame the instinct of hunger. Instinct is intelligent, but it is

not the same as acquired individual intelligence; it is untaught.

When the nuthatch carries a fragment of a hickory-nut to a tree and wedges it into a crevice in the bark, the bird is not showing an individual act of intelligence: all nuthatches do this; it is a race instinct. The act shows intelligence,--that is, it adapts means to an end,--but it is not like human or individual intelligence, which adapts new means to old ends, or old means to new ends, and which springs up on the occasion. Jays and chickadees hold the nut or seed they would peck under the foot, but the nuthatch makes a vise to hold it of the bark of the tree, and one act is just as intelligent as the other; both are the promptings of instinct. But when man makes a vise, or a wedge, or a bootjack, he uses his individual intelligence. When the jay carries away the corn you put out in winter and hides it in old worms' nests and knot-holes and crevices in trees, he is obeying the instinct of all his tribe to pilfer and hide things,--an instinct that plays its part in the economy of nature, as by its means many acorns and chestnuts get planted and large seeds widely disseminated. By this greed of the jay the wingless nuts take flight, oaks are planted amid the pines, and chestnuts amid the hemlocks.

Speaking of nuts reminds me of an incident I read of the deer or white-footed mouse--an incident that throws light on the limitation of animal intelligence. The writer gave the mouse hickory-nuts, which it attempted to carry through a crack between the laths in the kitchen wall. The nuts were too large to go through the crack. The mouse would try to push them through; failing in that, he would go through and then try to pull them after him. All night he or his companion seems to have kept up this futile attempt, fumbling and dropping the nut every few minutes. It never occurred to the mouse to gnaw the hole larger, as it would instantly have done had the hole been too small to admit its own body. It could not project its mind thus far; it could not get out of itself sufficiently to regard the nut in its relation to the hole, and it is doubtful if any four-footed animal is capable of that degree of reflection and comparison. Nothing in its own life or in the life of its ancestors had prepared it to meet that kind of a difficulty with nuts. And yet the writer who made the above observation says that when confined in a box, the sides of which are of unequal thickness, the deer mouse, on attempting to gnaw out, almost invariably attacks the thinnest side. How does he know which is the thinnest side? Probably by a delicate and trained sense of feeling or hearing. In gnawing through obstructions from within, or from without, he and his kind have had ample experience.

Now when we come to insects, we find that the above inferences do not hold. It has been observed that when a solitary wasp finds its hole in the ground too small to admit the spider or other insect which it has brought, it falls to and enlarges it. In this and in other respects certain insects seem to take the step of reason that quadrupeds are incapable of.

Lloyd Morgan relates at some length the experiments he tried with his fox terrier, Tony, seeking to teach him how to bring a stick through a fence with vertical palings. The spaces would allow the dog to pass through, but the palings caught the ends of the stick which the dog carried in his mouth. When his master encouraged him, he pushed and struggled vigorously. Not succeeding, he went back, lay down, and began gnawing the stick. Then he tried again, and stuck as before, but by a chance movement of his head to one side finally got the stick through. His master patted him approvingly and sent him for the stick again. Again he seized it by the middle, and of course brought up against the palings. After some struggles he dropped it and came through without it. Then, encouraged by his master, he put his head through, seized the stick, and tried to pull it through, dancing up and down in his endeavors. Time after time and day after day the experiment was repeated with practically the same results. The dog never mastered the problem. He could not see the relation of that stick to the opening in the fence. At one time he worked and tugged three minutes trying to pull the stick through. Of course, if he had had any mental conception of the problem or had thought about it at all, a single trial would have convinced him as well as would a dozen trials. Mr. Morgan tried the experiment with other dogs with like result. When they did get the stick through, it was always by chance.

It has never been necessary that the dog or his ancestors should know how to fetch long sticks through a narrow opening in a fence. Hence he does not know the trick of it. But we have a little bird that knows the trick. The house wren will carry a twig three inches long through a hole of half that diameter. She knows how to manage it because the wren tribe have handled twigs so long in building their nests that this knowledge has become a family instinct.

What we call the intelligence of animals is limited for the most part to sense perception and sense memory. We teach them certain things, train them to do tricks quite beyond the range of their natural intelligence, not because we enlighten their minds or develop their reason, but mainly by the force of habit. Through repetition the act becomes automatic. Who ever saw a trained animal, unless it be the elephant, do anything that betrayed the least spark of conscious intelligence? The trained pig, or the trained dog, or the trained lion does its "stunt" precisely as a machine would do it--without any more appreciation of what it is doing. The trainer and public performer find that things must always be done in the same fixed order; any change, anything unusual, any strange sound, light, color, or movement, and trouble at once ensues.

I read of a beaver that cut down a tree which was held in such a way that it did not fall, but simply dropped down the height of the stump. The beaver cut it off again; again it dropped and refused to fall; he cut it off a third and a fourth time: still the tree stood. Then he

gave it up. Now, so far as I can see, the only independent intelligence the animal showed was when it ceased to cut off the tree. Had it been a complete automaton, it would have gone on cutting--would it not?--till it made stove-wood of the whole tree. It was confronted by a new problem, and after a while it took the hint. Of course it did not understand what was the matter, as you and I would have, but it evidently concluded that something was wrong. Was this of itself an act of intelligence? Though it may be that its ceasing to cut off the tree was simply the result of discouragement, and involved no mental conclusion at all. It is a new problem, a new condition, that tests an animal's intelligence. How long it takes a caged bird or beast to learn that it cannot escape! What a man would see at a glance it takes weeks or months to pound into the captive bird, or squirrel, or coon. When the prisoner ceases to struggle, it is probably not because it has at last come to understand the situation, but because it is discouraged. It is checked, but not enlightened.

Even so careful an observer as Gilbert White credits the swallow with an act of judgment to which it is not entitled. He says that in order that the mud nest may not advance too rapidly and so fall of its own weight, the bird works at it only in the morning, and plays and feeds the rest of the day, thus giving the mud a chance to harden. Had not the genial parson observed that this is the practice of all birds during nest-building--that they work in the early morning hours and feed and amuse themselves the rest of the day? In the case of the mud-builders, this interim of course gives the mud a chance to harden, but are we justified in crediting them with this forethought?

Such skill and intelligence as a bird seems to display in the building of its nest, and yet at times such stupidity! I have known a phoebe-bird to start four nests at once, and work more or less upon all of them. She had deserted the ancestral sites under the shelving rocks and come to a new porch, upon the plate of which she started her four nests. She blundered because her race had had little or no experience with porches. There were four or more places upon the plate just alike, and whichever one of these she chanced to strike with her loaded beak she regarded as the right one. Her instinct served her up to a certain point, but it did not enable her to discriminate between those rafters. Where a little original intelligence should have come into play she was deficient. Her progenitors had built under rocks where there was little chance for mistakes of this sort, and they had learned through ages of experience to blend the nest with its surroundings, by the use of moss, the better to conceal it. My phoebe brought her moss to the new timbers of the porch, where it had precisely the opposite effect to what it had under the gray mossy rocks.

I was amused at the case of a robin that recently came to my knowledge. The bird built its nest in the south end of a rude shed that covered a table at a railroad terminus upon which a locomotive

was frequently turned. When her end of the shed was turned to the north she built another nest in the temporary south end, and as the reversal of the shed ends continued from day to day, she soon had two nests with two sets of eggs. When I last heard from her, she was consistently sitting on that particular nest which happened to be for the time being in the end of the shed facing toward the south. The bewildered bird evidently had had no experience with the tricks of turn-tables!

An intelligent man once told me that crabs could reason, and this was his proof: In hunting for crabs in shallow water, he found one that had just cast its shell, but the crab put up just as brave a fight as ever, though of course it was powerless to inflict any pain; as soon as the creature found that its bluff game did not work, it offered no further resistance. Now I should as soon say a wasp reasoned because a stingless drone, or male, when you capture him, will make all the motions with its body, curving and thrusting, that its sting-equipped fellows do. This action is from an inherited instinct, and is purely automatic. The wasp is not putting up a bluff game; it is really trying to sting you, but has not the weapon. The shell-less crab quickly reacts at your approach, as is its nature to do, and then quickly ceases its defense because in its enfeebled condition the impulse of defense is feeble also. Its surrender was on physiological, not upon rational grounds.

Thus do we without thinking impute the higher faculties to even the lowest forms of animal life. Much in our own lives is purely automatic--the quick reaction to appropriate stimuli, as when we ward off a blow, or dodge a missile, or make ourselves agreeable to the opposite sex; and much also is inherited or unconsciously imitative.

Because man, then, is half animal, shall we say that the animal is half man? This seems to be the logic of some people. The animal man, while retaining much of his animality, has evolved from it higher faculties and attributes, while our four-footed kindred have not thus progressed.

Man is undoubtedly of animal origin, but his rise occurred when the principle of variation was much more active, when the forms and forces of nature were much more youthful and plastic, when the seething and fermenting of the vital fluids were at a high pitch in the far past, and it was high tide with the creative impulse. The world is aging, and, no doubt, the power of initiative in Nature is becoming less and less. I think it safe to say that the worm no longer aspires to be man.

=====
==

RATIONALISM AND THE IDEA OF GOD

The Project Gutenberg eBook, *Essays of a Biologist*, by Julian Huxle

GODS

*Surprised by doubt, and longing but to know,
I asked of men and books what God might be:--
"An immanent spirit, clothed with the world we see"--
"A King of kings, ruler of all below"--
"Pure Love"--"A golden calf set up for show"--
"A jealous chief and tribal sectary"--
"Figment of fear and Man's servility"--
"The final Judge that dooms to joy or woe" ...*

*I turned away; and found my God alone.
God is the world--yet captive in our thought:
Our thought--when it the head of the world is grown:
Love--with what love we to ourselves have taught.
The Soul must incarnate Divinity,
And God in each anew must builded be.*

RATIONALISM AND THE IDEA OF GOD

"Du gleichst dem Geist, den du begreifst."
--GOETHE.

*"Nowadays, matters of national defence, of politics, of religion,
are still too important for Knowledge, and remain subjects for
certitude; that is to say, in them we still prefer the comfort of
instinctive belief because we have not learnt adequately to value
the capacity to foretell."--W. TROTTER.*

No one who has read Flaubert's *Tentation de St. Antoine* will be likely to forget that amazing procession of Gods, hundreds upon hundreds, in every diversity of form, defiling past the visionary Saint to topple over into the abyss of nothingness and be for ever destroyed--the doomed and outworn divinities of man's childhood and adolescence, put away as he came to maturity. "Man created God in his own image," wrote the irrepressible pen of Voltaire; and if it is not always true that Gods have been in his own image, but also in the image of animals and monsters, of embodied fears and hopes, it is indubitable that man has created God after God, only to throw them on the scrapheap as he outgrows them, like a child rejecting his old toys for new.

Indubitable--in a sense; indubitable that he has given each of them

their peculiar and characteristic form, endowed this and that God with different qualities. But there is another part which he has not created, which he can only perceive, mould, clothe. The raw material of Divinity and its elemental attributes are given--man can but take it or leave it; and, what is more, it is difficult for him to leave it. It is given as the raw material and elemental attributes of life are given, and the evolutionary process can but take them. Man moulds and forms; but evolution has no more created living matter than he Divinity.

* * * * *

I propose, then, to lay down as my main point that the idea of God is an inevitable product of biological evolution, arising when the human type of mind first came into being, and taking shape and form as a definite God or Gods. That the Gods who thus arise, although of course they play a rôle in the affairs of the human species only, have a definite biological function. That the term God can still be properly and profitably employed to denote a certain complex of phenomena, with a certain function in human evolution.

What, then, do we mean by saying that the idea of God arises inevitably with the appearance of man upon the evolutionary scene? How can the appearance of man account for such a curious phenomenon?

With man, for the first time in the history of life upon the earth, an organism appeared capable of generalizing, of framing concepts, and of communicating them to his fellows. Through sense-organs and brain, an organism reflects in its mind some of the events of the world outside, creates some sort of a microcosm over against the macrocosm. But the animal with no more than associative memory can at best create a haphazard microcosm, a mere cinema record, and incomplete at that, of the most elementary organization; while all one can say of its power of profiting by experience is that a certain primitive plot is thus provided for the series of adventures which make up the scenario.

With an organism like man, however, in which to the faculty of associative memory there has been superadded the power of framing concepts and of accumulating experience by tradition, the picture is altogether changed. The microcosm becomes more highly organized; from rough-and-tumble cinema it develops into an elaborate drama, whose plot is knotted up in the same general way as that of the great macrocosmic drama unrolling itself outside. Microcosm images macrocosm more nearly, both in its form and in its scope. As result of this, life is for the first time enabled in man's person to frame some general ideas of the outer world. Not only is it enabled, it cannot help but do so. The outer world is there; it impinges through man's sense-organs on his mind, and his mind is so constructed that, if it thinks at all, it must think in general terms.

For the first time, life becomes aware of something more than a set

of events; it becomes aware of a system of powers operating in events. These powers (to use a general, and what is intended to be a non-committal, term) are in constant action upon man's life. There is a power in the sun, a power in the storm, in the growth of crops, in wild beasts, in strange tribes, in the unrealized recesses of man's own heart; and in the course of his life man is brought into contact with these powers, which may act with him or against him. Man frames his own idea of these powers; and once that idea is framed, it exerts an effect upon the rest of his ideas, upon his emotions, upon his conduct. The more strongly the idea is held, the greater the effect.

But the idea may obviously be held and organized in many different ways. It is when the idea is organized in one particular way that we call it religious. We call it religious when on the one hand it involves some recognition of powers operating so as to underlie the general operations of the world; and, on the other hand, when it involves the emotions. It must involve the idea of the general powers operating in the outer world; so that an emotional reaction entirely limited to a single human being, or to beauty, or to a single event, is not religious. And it must involve the emotional nature of man, so that a purely intellectual investigation of the powers in operation, or a purely practical response, a purely moral reaction to them, is again not religious.

* * * * *

In primitive societies, as the studies of a Frazer or a Rivers have shown us, the whole of life is enmeshed with religion, and there is scarcely an activity of man which is not spun round with religious emotion and ritual. Very often the idea of God has not in this stage been clearly formulated; there is simply a notion of power, of mysterious influence, sometimes partly crystallized round a primitive deity. Later, however, the power became frankly anthropomorphic, and Gods came into being--many or one. Man had projected the idea of that active agency he knew best--human personality--into his idea of cosmic powers.

Into the God thus fashioned there are always projected, to greater or less degree, the ideals of the community; and thus, at a certain stage of development, we find definitely tribal Gods. Here the biological function of Gods becomes extremely obvious. The God, by his inspired prophets and priests, orders the destruction of his rivals--the false Gods of neighbouring tribes--or of his enemies, the members of those tribes.

The people of the tribe, however the result may have been brought about, do as a matter of fact find themselves, all unconsciously, caught up in the system which they and their forefathers have made. They have fashioned their God so that their inmost life is joined to him. When they sin, they fear him; when they look into their own

hearts to take stock of their ultimate ideals, they find that these are attached, through the impalpable but infinitely resistant fibres of tradition, of childish memory and of education, to him; he is on their side against their enemies, so that their advantage is on the whole his.

Whatever, therefore, arouses the idea of God in their minds will send messages into every corner of their being. And if they can be firmly persuaded that God wishes something done, the call will pull at their heart-strings and bring them to convinced and united action.

The most familiar example of this type of effect is to be found in the history of the Jews in the Old Testament. But even to-day such tribal ideas are not extinct: an educated and charming lady said to me during the war--"I am convinced that if Jesus Christ were alive to-day He would be fighting on the side of the Allies." ...

* * * * *

In our further analysis we must carefully distinguish between the outer and inner components of the idea of God. The outer components are the powers acting upon man. Some of these are inorganic--storms, winds, floods, the sun and moon; others are organic--wild beasts, pestilence, crops, and fruits, domesticated animals; others again are human--personal or national enemies, the community in which the individual lives. And they may act upon man's body or upon his mind. The sun warms his body, but makes an impression on his mind as well. The practice of astrology shows what power can be exerted on the mind by quite imaginary properties of external reality. But, whatever we may think of these outer components, there they are, and they do affect us for better or for worse. Before such a heterogeneous assemblage as is constituted by the outer components can operate as a single idea, can deserve a single name such as God, they must be elaborately organized.

The contribution to the idea of God from within, from the mind of man himself, is its form; and this form is the outcome of a process of mental organization every bit as real as the physical organization occurring in the unborn embryo.

The essential thing about both is, as we have indicated, that unity should arise in spite of diversity, and the resulting entity--organism in the one case, organized idea in the other--should thus be able to act as a single whole.

The system of ideas which man holds concerning external powers may be thus organized by thinking of it in terms of magic, of "influence," manifesting itself in different ways in different operations of Nature; or in terms of personality, the manifestations of power being supposed to result from the activities of a being or beings more or less similar to ourselves; or it may be organized, as we shall see, on more

scientific lines, by carefully pruning away all parts of it which are either definitely the mere product of our own imaginations, or else are not proven.

Thus what we have called the raw material of Divinity is given in the outer forces of nature, which not only act upon man as they act upon all organisms, but are by him perceived so to act in a way special and peculiar to man alone.

But, being so perceived, they are inevitably taken up into his mental life and made part of his mental organization. They are often perceived emotionally--to take the simplest examples, pestilence with horror, storm with fear, the growing of crops with gratitude. They are bound to enter into relation with his emotions, with his ideals and hopes; bound also to be in some degree generalized intellectually. When thus emotionally and intellectually built up so as to form a coherent and unitary idea, then only do they deserve the name of a God.

In parenthesis, let us make it quite clear that we are speaking of God and Gods as they operate in human affairs, as they can be classified by the anthropologist, analysed by the philosopher, experienced by the mystic. These have always been constituted as we have described--as a particular idea of the powers of nature, the cosmic forces taking shape through the moulding and organizing capacity of human thought, or, if you prefer it, as an interpretation and unification of outer and inner reality. The Absolute God, on the other hand, may be one--may, in fact, operate as a unitary whole in the same sense as this extraordinary product of the evolutionary process, this anthropological God; but we can never know it as such in the same sense as we know a person to be one.

This may be illustrated by a common fallacy--the ascription of personality to God on the ground that a purpose exists in the universe. Paley saw proof of this purpose in adaptations among organisms. Modern theologians, driven from this position by Darwin, take refuge with Bergson in the fact of biological progress. But this, too, can be shown to be as natural and inevitable a product of the struggle for existence as is adaptation, and to be no more mysterious than, for instance, the increase in effectiveness both of armour-piercing projectile and armour-plate during the last century. The time has gone by when a Paley could advance his "carpenter" view of God; when a Fellow of the Royal Society could be sure of general approval, as could D. Prout in his *Bridgewater Treatise*, with a work entitled Chemistry, Meteorology, and the Function of Digestion, considered with reference to Natural Theology, or when a distinguished geologist like Buckland (almost foreshadowing later writers of a certain type on labour questions) could ascribe to a Beneficent Designer the existence of Carnivora, as a means to the increase of the "Aggregate of Animal Enjoyment," and solemnly open a sentence such as "while each suffering individual is soon relieved from pain, it contributes its enfeebled carcass to the

support of its carnivorous benefactors.”

No--purpose is a psychological term; and to ascribe purpose to a process merely because its results are somewhat similar to those of a true purposeful process, is completely unjustified, and a mere projection of our own ideas into the economy of nature. Where we experience only phenomena of one order we cannot hope to reach behind them to phenomena of another order, or to the Absolute.

The ground is now cleared for our real investigation--our inquiry into the task which Rationalism has before it in finding how best what we have called the raw material of Divinity may be organized by the mind's activity, how best clothed with word or symbol to make it more the common property of mankind as a whole.

The current Christian conception of God is of a person who is also the creator and the ruler of the universe. This person has certain attributes--is omnipotent, omniscient, and somehow, in spite of all the unhappiness and squalor and cruelty in the world, all-loving. He has personal qualities--he created the universe, and all that is in it; he takes pleasure in being worshipped; is displeased when men or women neglect him, or commit crimes or sins; takes pity on the follies and sufferings of man; and was so moved by them (albeit after a very considerable period had elapsed since man had first appeared upon the scene) that he sent his son into the world as a redeemer. (For simplicity's sake, I omit all reference to the complexities of Trinitarian doctrine, which, however important in distinguishing Christianity from other religions envisaging an omnipotent personal God, do not affect the essential point at issue.) Further, he grants petitions, reveals himself to certain chosen persons, and is enthroned in a somewhat elusive heaven, where he is (or will be after the Day of Judgment--opinions seem to differ somewhat on the subject) surrounded by the immortal souls of the elect.

Now this view, or any view of God as a personal being, is becoming frankly untenable. The difficulty of understanding the functions of a personal ruler in a universe which the march of knowledge is showing us ever more clearly as self-ordered and self-ordering in every minutest detail is becoming more and more apparent. Either a personal God is a ruler without power, or he is the universe. In the former case he becomes a mere fly on the wheel; in the latter we revert to a frank pantheism, in which the idea of a personal Being can no longer properly be upheld. A personal creation of the world, in any reasonable sense of that term, is now meaningless except for a hypothetical creation of the original substance of the cosmos in the first instance. Creation of earth and stars, plants, animals, and man--Darwin swept the last vestiges of that into the waste-paper basket of outworn imaginations, already piled high with the debris of earlier ages. After the psychological insight which the last half-century has given us, miracles have ceased to be miracles, and have become either

delusions, or, more frequently, unusual phenomena for which a cause has not yet been found. The immutability of the fundamental laws of matter and motion, more particularly the grand generalization of the conservation of energy and the substitution by science of an orderly for a disorderly conception of nature, make it impossible to think of occasional interference by God with this world's affairs. Accordingly the value of petitionary prayer falls to the ground. Revelation and inspiration have resolved themselves into exceptional mental states, and are no longer looked upon as a sort of telepathy between divine and human minds. If we reflect, we see that all these intellectual difficulties in modern theology arise from the advance of scientific knowledge, which has shown that the older ideas of God were only symbolic, and therefore false when the attempt was made to give real value to them.

That being the quagmire in which traditional Christian theology is floundering, it behoves us to discuss the opposite side of the question, and to see whether the very advance of science which has seemed to exert only a destructive influence may not have made it possible to build up new and sounder conceptions of fundamental religious ideas.

We have already seen that the conception of God always represents man's idea of the powers operating in the universe; that it has two components--the outer consisting of these powers so far as they are known to man, the inner consisting in the mode in which the conception is organized and the way it is related to the rest of the personality. It is obvious that both man's knowledge of the cosmic powers as well as his method of organizing them in his mind can grow and change; and man's Gods can--and do--grow and change accordingly.

The growth of science in the last few centuries has radically altered our knowledge of the outer world. It has shown us, in the first place, a fundamental unity of all phenomena, however apparently diverse. It has shown us the inorganic part of the cosmos pursuing a direction--the progressive degradation of energy--which, if it is carried to its limit, will result in the extinction not only of life, but of all activity. It has next shown us the organic part, sprung from the inorganic but running a different course, ascending during evolutionary time to increasing heights of complexity and to increasing control over its inorganic environment.

Finally, we have the psychozoic or human portion--that minute fraction of the cosmos which yet is of a preponderant importance, since it definitely represents the highest level yet reached by evolutionary progress. In this sphere mind is the dominant partner, biologically speaking, in the mind-matter partnership; evolution can begin to be conscious instead of fortuitous; and true values arise which, incorporated in ideals and purposes, exert an effect upon events.

As regards our own mental organization, psychological science has recently shown us the enormous importance of what we may call the extra-personal portion of our mind--all that which is normally subconscious, or has not been during our mental growth incorporated to form an integral part of our private personality. But this extra-personal part of the mind may from time to time irrupt into the personal, and does normally do so at some period of life. It is the merit of psychology to have shown the true nature of this relationship between personal and extra-personal, which was in the past a source of an infinity of mistaken ideas--revelation, inspiration, possession, direct communion with angels, saints, gods, or devils, and so forth.

Thus the powers operating in the cosmos are, though unitary, yet subdivisible; and, though subdivisible, yet related. There are the vast powers of inorganic nature, neutral or hostile to man. Yet they gave birth to evolving life, whose development, though blind and fortuitous, has tended in the same general direction as our own conscious desires and ideals, and so gives us an external sanction for our directional activities. This again gave birth to human mind, which, in the race, is changing the course of evolution by acceleration, by the substitution of new methods for old, and by introducing values which are ultimate for the human species; and, in the individual, provides, in the interplay of conscious and subconscious, unbounded possibilities of the invasion of the ordinary and humdrum personality of every day by ideas apparently infinite, emotions the most disinterested and overwhelming.

Still other light has of late years been thrown by psychology upon the inner component of the idea of God. Recent work has shown, for instance, that the mind, unless deliberately corrected and trained, tends to think in terms of symbols instead of along the more arduous paths of intellectual reasoning, tends to explain the unknown in terms of the known, tends accordingly to project the familiar ideas of its own personality as symbols for the explanation of the most varied phenomena. The science of comparative religion has shown us an early stage of religious belief in which but one idea held sway--the idea of a magical influence residing in all things potent for good or ill: the projection was so complete that no distinction whatever was made between the personal and the impersonal. Later, the idea of particular divine beings or Gods arose; and in early stages man still continued to project not only his own passions, but even his own form, into these divinities. The statement of Genesis that God made man in his own image is in reality an admission of the converse process. Still later, the divinity was purged of the grossness of human form and members, and, gradually, of characteristically human passions; but God remained personal, although the personality was now organized chiefly of ideals.

There is, however, no reason whatever to admit that personality is a genuine characteristic of any knowable God; but every reason to suspect that it is, as a matter of hard fact, merely another product of this property of projection so strong in the human mind.

On the other hand, an analysis of religious experience as a phenomenon, as something equally worthy of patient and scientific study as the gas-laws or the methods of evolution, shows that the powers which move in the universe, when organized by thought into a God, are apprehended by the majority of the great mystics and those to whom religious experience has been richly granted as in some way personal. Although, if our line of argument is valid, this will be partly due to a projection of the idea of personality into the idea of God, yet it is clearly in part due to the idea of God being organized by our mental activity to be of the same general type as is a normal personality--as something into which concepts of power, of knowledge, and of feeling and will all enter, with such interconnections between its parts that, like a personality, all of its resources are capable of mobilization at any one point. It will be one of the great constructive tasks of psychology to ascertain just how such a conception is organized, and how it operates to produce the experiences, often of overpowering intensity and lasting value, which as a matter of record it often does.[43]

Put broadly and roughly, there are, then, three main accounts possible, or at any rate actually found in occidental civilization to-day, of the phenomena generally known as religious. The first is that of the out-and-out sceptic--that they are all illusions, imaginations of the childhood of the race. This is an extreme view which I do not feel called upon to discuss. The second is the view of almost every existing religious denomination in Europe--that God is a personal being. And the third is one, only just beginning to take shape, which I have endeavoured, with every consciousness of inadequacy, to outline--the account made possible by a radically scientific view of the universe.

Those who adopt the third attitude believe that the second is a purely symbolic and not very accurate presentation of certain fundamental facts, of which they are attempting to give what seems to them an account which is closer to reality. Before the scientific work of the last three or four centuries, it was impossible to attempt what we may call a realistic account of this nature, so that symbols were perforce adopted. In Christian theology man formulated a coherent scheme, which, however, was purely symbolic, to account for the facts we have just been considering. The chief feature in any such scheme must be the conception of the powers with which man feels himself in relation; and in this particular formulation his conception of these powers was that of a God who was also a person.

Now, the danger of symbols and symbolic thinking comes when the symbols are accepted for real, and taken as they stand for bases from which conclusions shall be drawn. The Christian theologians did not hesitate--why should they, in their position?--to use the personal nature of the Deity as one premiss in a whole series of syllogisms, and to accept at their full face value the conclusions which emerged from

these syllogisms.

If a personal God was ruler of the universe, then he must be omnipotent; if truly divine, then omniscient; if worthy of worship, then all-wise. He must be capable of interfering with the course of events by "miracles," of granting our prayers, of communicating directly with us, of deciding our fate in afterlife. From these conclusions yet further conclusions were drawn. If God revealed himself in the Bible, then the Bible was "true" ... with all that this in its turn involved as to our beliefs concerning natural causation, creation, our relations with God, or personal immortality. The whole scheme was self-consistent, and worked as well as many other human schemes. But what if the whole premiss, of God as a personal being, ruler and father and judge--what if this were not in fact tenable? Then, of course, the whole edifice itself would come toppling down. That is what is actually happening to-day. God, as personal ruler, is being slowly driven out of the universe, but returning as this organized idea of which we have spoken.

Another cardinal point in the older systems has always been its claim to possess a revelation of Truth which is in some real ways complete and absolute.

This leads us on immediately to a subject of especial interest to us as rationalists--namely, the relation of religion to science and to free inquiry. Religious beliefs, if they are really believed with any conviction, will be to a greater or less extent dominant beliefs, because by their nature they concern the general relationship between man and his surroundings, which must bulk large in all our lives; and it is matter of common experience with what obstinacy and fanaticism they may be held. If therefore a system of religious belief includes the belief that it is revealed, and therefore true with a more ultimate and complete truth than the truths of observation or experiment, any fact or idea which conflicts with any part of the system will be inevitably treated not only as dangerous to the system, but as actually evil: and this tendency is reinforced by the craving of the average man for certainty, for intellectual satisfaction without undue intellectual effort. The cynic who said that beliefs are generally held with an intensity inversely proportional to the amount of evidence which can be adduced in their support was not wholly or only cynical.

Since, however, the progress of modern science, in addition to the discovery of many wholly new facts, has largely consisted in a proper investigation and a revaluation of the facts subsumed without full analysis into the symbolism of theology, the inevitable result has been for the two to find each other in constant antagonism. But be it noted that it is not science and religion which are in conflict, but science and a particular brand of religion.

The essence of science is free inquiry combined with experimental

testing. The result is a body of knowledge, of fact, and explanatory theory, which can properly be regarded as established. By established, however, we do not mean that it is absolute or immutable--we expect addition and modification. But we also expect that, in the future as in the past, the additions and alterations will not involve the scrapping and rebuilding of the whole edifice, but that it will continue to be harmonious with itself, and to undergo a gradual evolution. This has been so even with such marked changes as the discovery of radioactivity, the new outlook in psychology, or the rediscovery of Mendelism--the new, after apparent contradiction, has been or is being harmoniously incorporated and organized with the old.

This in its turn implies that toleration should ever be encouraged by the scientist. Humility cannot be genuine if combined with unsupported dogmatic assertion: and the recognition that the ideas of revelation and divine personality are such dogmatic assertions brings a whole new outlook into being.

Putting matters in a nutshell, we can say that a system based on revelation or on the pushing of unsupported premisses concerning the nature of God to their complete logical conclusions is bound to result in some degree of hostility to the pursuit of truth for its own sake; whereas a religious system basing itself on scientific method, while it must resign itself to being unable to produce a complete, ready-made, and immutable scheme, however beloved of the multitude (and indeed so beloved because it satisfies a lower and more primitive mode of thinking only), on the other hand can be assured that its knowledge and effectiveness will increase, and that contradictions will resolve themselves, provided that free inquiry, free speech, and tolerance are allowed and practised. Attempts to reconcile the old formulation with the new facts and ideas, when not insincere, are doomed to failure because the premisses of the two systems are different.

In conclusion, we may perhaps point out some of the bearings of such a change. In the first place, the change in our conception of God necessitates the stressing of religious experience, as such, as against belief in particular dogma, or in the efficacy of special ritual.

Secondly, it emphasizes the need for tolerance and enlightenment. The scientific view asserts not that its knowledge is absolute or complete, but that, although relative and partial, it will indubitably continue to grow harmoniously along the general lines already laid down.

Another change wrought by the inclusion of all phenomena under one head and the banishment of the supernatural is the inestimable advantage that we thereby find the possibility of constructing a single general view of the universe for civilization. At present there are two that matter--the orthodox religious and the scientific. The religious starts from the top, the scientific from the bottom; but the scientific has been creeping up, and now that it has begun to attack the problem

of mind it will be able to drown the other out. Since the current religious formulation is only symbolic, it cannot become scientific; but since the scientific is based on the closest possible analysis of reality, it can become religious so far as it investigates the realities of religious experience.

Once it has done this, we shall be able to construct a *Weltanschauung* such as never before, with roots in the ordered reactions of inorganic matter, trunk strong with the steady progress of evolving life, and branches reaching up into the highest realities of the spirit. Union is strength; and it is one of the prime duties of educated men and women to see that the present duality and antagonism at the heart of what should be the central unity of civilization--of its most fundamental idea, its conception of the universe--should be terminated.

The new outlook will also interlock with the youthful science of psychology to produce great results. Much of what now is interpreted, by all save the few experts, in supernatural terms of the old theology will become intelligible as a product of the natural workings of that amazing thing, the human mind. We shall not have sects trying to exploit the normal dissatisfactions and disharmonies of adolescence in order to secure "conversions"; repressed tendencies will not be thought to be the voice of a personal Devil, nor neglected ideals the voice of a personal God. Irrational fear, to-day still the greatest enemy of mankind and most potent annihilator of happiness, will, by comprehension of its curious mechanism and its persistence, often transformed, from childhood to adult life, become amenable to treatment and be made more and more to disappear. Proper analysis of mental processes such as repression, suppression, and sublimation will enable us to make better use of our faculties, and deliberately to build up treasures of spiritual experience now attainable only by the lucky few in whom temperament and circumstances accidentally conspire.

On the moral side, the idea that a Divine command has, at some remote period in the past, provided a fixed code, and the belief in the immutable truth of certain dogmas--these will happily disappear. Morals, like all else, not only have evolved, but should evolve. We shall find, for instance, that no excuse will be left for the common horrified (and horrible) views of sex, as of something inherently hateful, of all its pleasures as involving sin; for it will be realized that too much of the present attitude is due to the projection of our own conflicts and complexes, our own prurientes and pruderies, into what might be innocent and joyous. But this merits a fuller discussion than we can here allot.

Again, if I had space at my disposal, I would write of the changes in the position and constitution of religion brought about by changes other than those in religious beliefs themselves. Most important, of course, are the spread of education on the one hand, and the spread of the facilities for the most varied spiritual enjoyment on the other.

If the people is educated to a point at which it can judge for itself, it wants no special priests or clerical mediators; its mediators are those who are specially fitted to unravel the intellectual, emotional, and moral difficulties of its own day and for all time--poets, philosophers, and men of science. The spread of facilities for reading, for seeing plays and works of art, and hearing good music, means of course that, whereas in ruder epochs the Church provided the principal way of psychological sublimation, now sublimation and spiritual refreshment can be achieved equally or more effectively (and every whit as religiously) without ever frequenting a "place of worship" or belonging to any denomination. This tendency towards fluidity and plasticity, towards many possibilities of sublimation instead of one, may by some be lamented. But, as a matter of fact, it is in full accord with all we know of biological progress. Man has attained his position of biological pre-eminence simply and solely by virtue of the plasticity of his mind, which substitutes infinitude of potentiality for the limited range of actuality given by the instinctive reactions of lower forms. Humanity will always have some religion, and it will always be of the utmost importance to man, both as individual and as species. But the possibility of satisfying his religious tendencies intellectually, emotionally, and morally, without rigid creed, limited ritual, and iron-bound code of morals, will mean the liberation of all that is best in religion from too narrow shackles, and the lifting it on to a plane where it may be not only more free, but more rich.

It is the task of Rationalism to see that religion, this fundamental and important activity of man, shall neither be allowed to continue in false or inadequate forms, nor be stifled or starved, but made to help humanity in a vigorous growth that is based on truth and in constant contact with reality.

(_For bibliography, see the end of the next essay._)

FOOTNOTE:

[43] See W. James, *_Varieties of Religious Experience_*; E. Underhill, *_Essentials of Mysticism_*.

=====

THE MOON A WORLD-WIDE DEITY.

The Project Gutenberg EBook of *Moon Lore*, by Rev. Timothy Harley

Anthropomorphism, or the representation of outward objects in the *_form_ of _man_*, wrought largely, as we have seen, in the manufacture of the man in the moon; it entered no less into the composition of the moon-god. The twenty-first verse of the fiftieth Psalm contains its recognition and rebuke. "Thou thoughtest that I

was altogether as thyself"; or, still more literally, "Thou hast thought that being, I shall be like thee." As Dr. Delitzsch says, "Because man in God's likeness has a bodily form, some have presumed to infer backwards therefrom that God also has a bodily form like to man, which is related by way of prototype to the human form." [125] As well might we say that because a watchmaker constructs a chronometer with a movement somewhat like that of his own heart, therefore he is mechanical, metallic, and round. Against this anthropomorphic materialism science lifts up its voice; for what modern philosopher, worthy of the name, fails to distinguish between phenomenon and fact, inert matter and active force? Says a recent writer, "We infer that as our own master of the mint is neither a sovereign nor a half-sovereign, so the force which coins and recoins this ulh, or matter, must be altogether in the god-part and none of it in the metal or paste in which it works." [126] With the progress of man's intelligence we shall observe improvement in this anthropomorphism, but it will still survive. As Mr. Baring-Gould tells us: "The savage invests God with bodily attributes; in a more civilized state man withdraws the bodily attributes, but imposes the limitations of his own mental nature; and in his philosophic elevation he recognises in God intelligence only, though still with anthropomorphic conditions." [127]

Xenophanes said that if horses, oxen, and lions could paint, they would make gods like themselves. And Ralph Waldo Emerson says: "The gods of fable are the shining moments of great men. We run all our vessels into one mould. Our colossal theologies of Judaism, Christism, Buddhism, Mahometism, are the necessary and structural action of the human mind. The student of history is like a man going into a warehouse to buy clothes or carpets. He fancies he has a new article. If he go to the factory, he shall find that his new stuff still repeats the scrolls and rosettes which are found on the interior walls of the pyramids of Thebes. Our theism is the purification of the human mind. Man can paint, or make, or think nothing but man. He believes that the great material elements had their origin from his thought. And our philosophy finds one essence collected or distributed." [128] And a devout author, whose orthodoxy --whatever that may mean--is unquestioned, acknowledges that man adored the unknown power in the sun, and "in the moon, which bathes the night with its serene splendours. Under this latter form, completed by a very simple anthropomorphism which applies to the gods the law of the sexes, the religions of nature weighed during long ages upon Western Asia." [129] A volume might be written upon this subject; but we have other work in hand.

It seems to be generally admitted that no form of idolatry is older than the worship of the moon. Lord Kames says, "It is probable that the sun and moon were early held to be deities, and that they were the first visible objects of worship." [130] Dr. Inman says, "That the sun and moon were at a very early period worshipped, none who has

studied antiquity can deny." [131] And Goldziher maintains that "the lunar worship is older than the solar." [132] Maimonides, "the light of Israel," says that the Zabaists not only worshipped the moon themselves, but they also asserted that Adam led mankind to that species of worship. No doubt luniolatry is as old as the human race. In some parts the moon is still the superior god. Mr. Tylor writes: "Moon worship, naturally ranking below sun worship in importance, ranges through nearly the same district of culture. There are remarkable cases in which the moon is recognised as a great deity by tribes who take less account, or none at all, of the sun. An old account of the Caribs describes them as esteeming the moon more than the sun, and at new moon coming out of their houses crying, Behold the moon!" [133] This deity, then, is ancient and modern: also a chief of the gods: let us now show that he is a god whose empire is the world.

We begin in Asia, and with the Assyrian monuments, which display many religious types and emblems. "Representations of the heavenly bodies, as sacred symbols, are of constant occurrence in the most ancient sculptures. In the bas-reliefs we find figures of the sun, moon, and stars, suspended round the neck of the king when engaged in the performance of religious ceremonies." [134] In Chaldaea "the moon was named Sin and Hur. Hurki, Hur, and Ur was the chief place of his worship, for the satellite was then considered as being masculine. The name for the moon in Armenian was Khaldi, which has been considered by some to be the origin of the word Chaldee, as signifying moon worshippers." [135] With this Chaldaean deity may be connected "the Akkadian moon god, who corresponds with the Semitic Sin," and who "is Aku, 'the seated-father,' as chief supporter of kosmic order, styled 'the maker of brightness,' En-zuna, 'the lord of growth,' and Idu, 'the measuring lord,' the Aïdês of Hesychios." [136]

"With respect to the name of Chaldaean, perhaps the most probable account of the origin of the word is, that it designates properly the inhabitants of the ancient capital, Ur or Hur,--Kkaldi being in the Burbur dialect the exact equivalent of Hur, which was the proper name of the moon god, and Chaldaeans being thus either 'moon worshippers,' or simply, inhabitants of the town dedicated to, and called after, the moon." [137] Again: "The first god of the second triad is Sin or Hurki, the moon deity. It is in condescension to Greek notions that Berosus inverts the true Chaldaean order, and places the sun before the moon in his enumeration of the heavenly bodies. Chaldaean mythology gives a very decided preference to the lesser luminary, perhaps because the nights are more pleasant than the days in hot countries. With respect to the names of the god, we may observe that Sin, the Assyrian or Semitic term, is a word of quite uncertain etymology, which, however, is found applied to the moon in many Semitic languages." [138] "Sin is used for the moon in Mendaean and Syriac at the present day. It is the name given to the

moon god in St. James of Seruj's list of the idols of Harran; and it was the term used for Monday by the Sabaeans as late as the ninth century." [139] Another author writes: "The Babylonian and Assyrian moon god is Sin, whose name probably appears in Sinai. The expression, 'from the origin of the god Sin,' was used by the Assyrians to mark remote antiquity; because, as chaos preceded order, so night preceded day, and the enthronement of the moon as the night-king marks the commencement of the annals of cosmic order." [140]

When we search the Hebrew Scriptures, we find too many allusions to the Queen of Heaven, to Astarte and the groves, for us to doubt that the Israelites adored

*"--moonèd Ashtaroth,
Heaven's queen and mother both." (Milton's _Odes_.)*

Dr. Goldziher is an incontestable authority, and thus writes: "Queen or Princess of Heaven is a very frequent name for the moon." [141] Again, "Even in the latest times the Hebrews called the moon the 'Queen of Heaven' (Jer. vii. 18), and paid her Divine honours in this character at the time of the captivity." [142] And, to complete this author's witness, he again says: "What was the antiquity of this lunar worship among the Hebrews, is testified (as has long been known) by the part played by Mount Sinai in the history of Hebrew religion. For this geographical name is doubtless related to _Sin_, one of the Semitic names of the moon. The mountain must in ancient times have been consecrated to the moon. The beginning of the Hebrew religion, which was connected with the phenomena of the night-sky, germinated first during the residence in Egypt on the foundation of an ancient myth. The recollection of this occasioned them to call the part of Egypt which they had long inhabited, *eres Sînîm*, 'moonland' (Isa. xlix. 12)." [143] It is but just that we should hear the other side, when there is a difference of opinion. The above mentioned 'Queen of Heaven' is beyond question the Ashtoreth or Astarte (identical with our _star_), which was the principal goddess of the Phoenicians; and we believe she was originally the goddess of the moon. This is doubted by a modern writer, who says, "Baal is constantly coupled with Astarte; and the more philosophical opinion is that this national god and goddess were the lord and lady of Phoenicia, rather than the sun and moon: for to a people full of political life the sun and moon would have been themselves representatives, while a Divine king and queen were the realities. And if so, the habitual inclination of the Israelites, an essentially political people, for this worship becomes the more easily understood." [144] Professor F. D. Maurice, in his *_Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy_*, also takes this view. The question here is not whether the Jews worshipped Astarte, but whether Astarte was the moon. This we cannot hesitate to answer in the affirmative. Kenrick writes: "Ashtoreth or Astarte appears physically to

represent the moon. She was the chief local deity of Sidon; but her worship must have been extensively diffused, not only in Palestine, but in the countries east of the Jordan, as we find Ashtarothe-Karnaim (Ashtarothe of two horns) mentioned in the book of Genesis (xiv. 5). This goddess, like other lunar deities, appears to have been symbolized by a heifer, or a figure with a heifer's head, whose horns resembled the crescent moon. The children of Israel renounced her worship at the persuasion of Samuel; and we do not read again of her idolatry till the reign of Solomon (1 Kings xi. 5), after which it appears never to have been permanently banished, though put down for a time by Josiah (2 Kings xxiii. 13). She is the Queen of Heaven, to whom, according to the reproaches of Jeremiah (vii. 18, xlv. 25), the women of Israel poured out their drink-offerings, and burnt incense, and offered cakes, regarding her as the author of their national prosperity. This epithet accords well with the supposition that she represented the moon, as some ancient authors inform us."

[145] Dr. Gotch, an eminent Hebrew scholar, says that there is no doubt that the moon is the symbol of productive power and must be identified with Astarte. "That this goddess was so typified can scarcely be doubted. The ancient name of the city, Ashtarothe-Karnaim, already referred to, seems to indicate a horned Astarte, that is an image with a crescent moon on her head like the Egyptian Athor. At any rate, it is certain that she was by some ancient writers identified with the moon, as Lucian and Herodian. On these grounds Movers, Winer, Keil, and others maintain that originally Ashtoreth was the moon goddess." [146] Clearly, then, the Hebrews worshipped the moon. But, even apart from Astarte, this worship may be proven on other evidence. Dr. Jamieson says that the word mena (moon: Anglo-Saxon, mona) "approaches most nearly to a word used by the prophet Isaiah, which has been understood by the most learned interpreters as denoting the moon. 'Ye are they that prepare a table for Gad, and that furnish the offering unto Meni.' (Isa. lxx. 11). As Gad is understood of the sun, we learn from Diodor Sicul that Meni is to be viewed as a designation of the moon." [147] This is Bishop Lowth's view. "The disquisitions and conjectures of the learned concerning Gad and Meni are infinite and uncertain: perhaps the most probable may be, that Gad means good fortune, and Meni the moon." [148] One point is worthy of notice. In our English version Meni is rendered "number"; and we know very well that by the courses of the moon ancient months and years were numbered. In Isaiah iii. 18 we find the daughters of Zion ornamented with feet-rings, and networks, and crescents: or, as our translation reads, "round tires like the moon." And, once more, in Ezekiel xlvi., we read that the gate of the inner court of the sanctuary that "looketh toward the east, shall be opened on the day of the new moon"; and the meat offering on "the day of the new moon shall be a young bullock without blemish, and six lambs, and a ram." If there was no sacred significance in the observance of these lunar changes, why did the writer of the New Testament Epistle to the Colossians say, "Let no man judge you in

respect of the new moon"? A competent scholar, in recognising this consociation of Hebrew religion with the moon's phases, rightly ascribes to it an earlier origin. Says Ewald: "To connect the annual festivals with the full moon, and to commence them in the evening, as though greeting her with a glad shout, was certainly a primitive custom, both among other races and in the circle of nations from which in the earliest times Israel sprang." [149] And the Bishop of Derry remarks: "To a religious Hebrew it was rather the moon than the sun which marked the seasons, as the calendar of the Church was regulated by it." [150] We have sought to place this Hebrew luniolatry beyond dispute, because so many Christians have supposed that "the chosen people" lived in unclouded light, and "the uncovenanted heathen" in outer and utter darkness.

Passing on we find that "in Pontus and Phrygia were temples to _Meen_, and Homer says _Meen_ presides over the months, whilst in the Sanskrit _Mina_, we see her connected with the Fish and Virgin. It is not improbable that the great Akaimenian race, as worshipping and upholding sun and moon faiths, were called after _Meni_, the moon." [151] Among the Arabians the moon was the great divinity, as may be learned from Pocock's _Specimen Historiae Arabum_; Prideaux's _Connection_; Gibbon's _Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire_; and Sale's _Preliminary Discourse_ to his translation of the _Koran_. Tiele says: "The ancient religion of the Arabs rises little higher than animistic polydaemonism. The names Itah and Shamsh, the sun god, occur among all the Semitic peoples; Allât, or Alilât, and Al-Uzza, as well as the triad of moon goddesses to which these last belong, are common to several, and the deities which bear them are reckoned among the chief." [152] The Saracens called the moon _Cabar_, the great; and its crescent is the religious symbol of the Turks to this day. Tradition says that "Philip, the father of Alexander, meeting with great difficulties in the siege of Byzantium, set the workmen to undermine the walls, but a crescent moon discovered the design, which miscarried; consequently the Byzantines erected a statue to Diana, and the crescent became the symbol of the state." Dr. Brewer, who cites this story, adds: "Another legend is that Othman, the sultan, saw in a vision a crescent moon, which kept increasing till its horns extended from east to west, and he adopted the crescent of his dream for his standard, adding the motto, _Donec repleat orbem_. " [153] Schlegel mentions the story that Mahomet "wished to pass with his disciples as a person transfigured in a supernatural light, and that the credulity of his followers saw the moon, or the moon's light, descend upon him, pierce his garments, and replenish him. That veneration for the moon which still forms a national or rather religious characteristic of the Mahometans, may perhaps have its foundation in the elder superstition, or pagan idolatry of the Arabs." [154] No doubt this last sentence contains the true elucidation of the crescent. For astrolatry lives in the east still. The _Koran_ may expressly forbid the practice, saying: "Bend not in adoration to the

sun or moon"; [155] yet, "monotheist as he is, the Moslem still claps his hands at sight of the new moon, and says a prayer." [156]

We come next to the Persians, whom Herodotus accuses of adoring the sun and moon. But, as Gibbon says, "the Persians of every age have denied the charge, and explained the equivocal conduct, which might appear to give colour to it." [157] It will certainly require considerable explanation to free from lunar idolatry the following passage, which we find in the _Zend Avesta_: "We sacrifice unto the new moon, the holy and master of holiness: we sacrifice unto the full moon, the holy and master of holiness." [158] Unquestionably the Persian recognised the Lord of Light _in_ the ordinances of heaven; and therefore his was superior to many forms of blind idol-worship. So far we may accept Hegel's interpretation of the _Zend_ doctrine. "Light is the _body of Ormuzd; thence the worship of fire, because Ormuzd is present in all light; but he is not the sun or moon itself In these the Persians venerate only the light, which is Ormuzd." [159] In fact, we owe to the Persians a valuable testimony to the God in whom is no darkness at all. "The prayer of Ajax was for light"; and we too little feel the Fire which burns and shines beyond the stars.

In Central India the sun and moon are worshipped by many tribes, as the Khonds, Korkús, Tunguses, and Buraets. The Korkús adore the powers of nature, as the gods of the tiger, bison, the hill, the cholera, etc., "but these are all secondary to the sun and the moon, which among this branch of the Kolarian stock, as among the Kols in the far east, are the principal objects of adoration." [160a] "Although the Tongusy in general worship the sun and moon, there are many exceptions to this observation. I have found intelligent people among them, who believed that there was a being superior to both sun and moon; and who created them and all the world." [160b] This last sentence we read with gratitude, but not with surprise. There is some good in all, if there seem to be all good in some.

"The aboriginal tribes in the Dekkan of India also acknowledge the presence of the sun and moon by an act of reverence." [161]

The inhabitants of the island of Celebes, in the East Indian Archipelago, "formerly acknowledged no gods but the sun and the moon, which were held to be eternal. Ambition for superiority made them fall out." [162] According to Milton, ambition created unpleasantness in the Hebrew heaven.

In Northern Asia the moon had adoring admirers among the Samoyedes, the Morduans, the Tschuwasches, and other tribes. This is stated by Sir John Lubbock. [163] Lord Kames says: "The people of Borneo worship the sun and moon as real divinities. The Samoides worship both, bowing to them morning and evening in the

Persian manner." [164] The _Samoides_ are the "salmon-eaters" of Asia.

Moon-worship in China is of ancient origin, and exists in our own time. Professor Legge tells us that the primitive _shih_ "is the symbol for manifestation and revelation. The upper part of it is the same as that in the older form of Tî, indicating 'what is above'; but of the three lines below I have not found a satisfactory account. Hsü Shan says they represent 'the sun, moon, and stars,' and that the whole symbolizes 'the indications by these bodies of the will of Heaven! Shih therefore tells us that the Chinese fathers believed that there was communication between heaven and men. The idea of revelation did not shock them. The special interpretation of the strokes below, however, if it were established, would lead us to think that even then, so far back, there was the commencement of astrological superstition, and also, perhaps, of Sabian worship." [165] Sabianism, as most readers are aware, is the adoration of the armies of heaven: the word being derived from the Hebrew _tzaba_, a host. Dr. Legge leaves Chinese Sabianism in some doubt, in the above quotation; but later on he speaks of the spirits associated with the solstitial worship, whose intercession was thus secured, "I, the emperor of the Great Illustrious dynasty, have respectfully prepared this paper, to inform the spirit of the sun, the spirit of the moon, the spirits of the five planets, of the constellations of the zodiac, and of all the stars in all the sky," and so on: and the professor adds: "This paper shows how there had grown up around the primitive monotheism of China the recognition and worship of a multitude of celestial and terrestrial spirits." [166] This is ample evidence to prove moon-worship. True, these celestial beings were "but ministering spirits," and the "monotheism remained." There was no _henotheism_, no worship of several _single_ supreme deities: _One only_ was supreme. So among the Hebrews, Persians, Hindoos, there was one only God; and yet they offered prayers and sacrifices to heaven's visible and innumerable host. When we come to modern China we shall find some very remarkable celebrations taking place, which throw sunlight upon these ancient mists. Meanwhile to strengthen our position, we may draw additional support from each of the three great stages reached in the progress of Chinese religion: namely, Confucianism, Taoism, and Buddhism. Dr. Edkins describes them as the moral, materialistic, and metaphysical systems, standing at the three corners of a great triangle. [167] The god of Confucianism is _Shang-tî_ or _Shang-te_. And with the universal anthropomorphism "Shang-te is the great father of gods and men: Shang-te is a gigantic man." [168] Again "Heaven is a great man, and man is a little heaven." [169] And now what does Confucianism say of moon-worship? "The sun and moon being the chief objects of veneration to the most ancient ancestors of the Chinese, they translated the soul of their great father heaven or the first man (Shang-te) to the sun, and the soul of their great mother earth or the first woman (the female half of the first

man) to the moon." [170] In Taoism there is no room for question. Dr. Legge says that it had its Chang and Liû, and "many more gods, supreme gods, celestial gods, great gods, and divine rulers." [171] And Dr. Edkins writes: "The Taouist mythology resembles, in several points, that of many heathen nations. Some of its divinities personate those beings that are supposed to reside in the various departments of nature. Many of the stars are worshipped as gods." [172] Buddhism not only supplies further evidence, it also furnishes a noteworthy instance of mythic transformation. Sakchi or Sasi, the moon, is literally one who made a sacrifice. This refers to the legend of the hare who gave himself to feed the god. The wife of Indra adopted the hare's name, and was herself called Sasi. "The Tantra school gave every deity its Sakti or consort, and speculation enlarged the meaning of the term still further, making it designate female energy or the female principle." [173] Buddhism, then, the popular religion in China at the present day, the religion which Dr. Farrar ventures to call "atheism fast merging into idolatry," [174] is not free from the nature worship which deifies the moon. But Buddhism, like most other imperfect systems, has precious gold mixed with its dross; and at the expense of a digression we delight to quote the statement of a recent writer, who says: "There is no record, known to me, in the whole of the long history of Buddhism, throughout the many countries where its followers have been for such lengthened periods supreme, of any persecution by the Buddhists of the followers of any other faith." [175] How glad we should feel if we could assert the same of the Christian Church!

We come at once to those celebrations which still take place in China, and illustrate the worship of the moon. The festival of Yue-Ping --which is held annually during the eighth month, from the first day when the moon is new, to the fifteenth, when it is full--is of high antiquity and of deep interest. Dr. Morrison says that "the custom of civil and military officers going on the first and fifteenth of every moon to the civil and military temples to burn incense, began in the time of the Luh Chaon," which would be not far from A.D. 550. Also that the "eighth month, fifteenth day, is called Chung-tsew-tsëë. It is said that the Emperor Ming-hwang, of the dynasty Tang, was one night led to the palace of the moon, where he saw a large assembly of Chang-go-sëën-neu--female divinities playing on instruments of music. Persons now, from the first to the fifteenth, make cakes like the moon, of various sizes, and paint figures upon them: these are called Yue-ping, 'mooncakes.' Friends and relations pay visits, purchase and present the cakes to each other, and give entertainments. At full moon they spread out oblations and make prostrations to the moon." [176] Dennys writes: "The fifteenth day of the eighth month is a day on which a ceremony is performed by the Chinese, which of all others we should least expect to find imitated among ourselves. Most people resident in China have seen the moon-cakes which so delight the heart of the Chinese during the eighth month of every year. These

are made for an autumnal festival often described as 'congratulating' or 'rewarding' the moon. The moon, it is well known, represents the female principle in Chinese celestial cosmogony, and she is further supposed to be inhabited by a multitude of beautiful females; the cakes made in her honour are therefore veritable offerings to the Queen of the Heavens. Now in a part of Lancashire, on the banks of the Ribble, there exists a precisely similar custom of making cakes in honour of the 'Queen of Heaven,'--a relic, in all probability, of the old heathen worship which was the common fount of the two customs." [177] Witness is also borne to this ceremony by a well-known traveller. "We arrived at Chaborté on the fifteenth day of the eighth moon, the anniversary of great rejoicings among the Chinese. This festival, known as the _Yue-Ping_ (loaves of the moon), dates from the remotest antiquity. Its original purpose was to honour the moon with superstitious rites. On this solemn day, all labour is suspended; the workmen receive from their employers a present of money, every person puts on his best clothes; and there is merry-making in every family. Relations and friends interchange cakes of various sizes, on which is stamped the image of the moon; that is to say, a hare crouching amid a small group of trees." [178] And Doolittle says: "It is always full moon on the fifteenth of every Chinese month; and, therefore, for several days previous, the evenings are bright, unless it happens to be cloudy, which is not often the case. The moon is a prominent object of attention and congratulation at this time. At Canton, it is said, offerings are made to the moon on the fifteenth. On the following day, young people amuse themselves by playing what is called '_pursuing_', or '_congratulating_' the moon. At this city [Fuhchau], in the observance of this festival, the expression '_rewarding the moon_' is more frequently used than 'congratulating the moon.' It is a common saying that there is 'a white rabbit in the moon pounding out rice.' The dark and the white spots on the moon's face suggest the idea of that animal engaged in the useful employment of shelling rice. The notion is prevalent that the moon is inhabited by a multitude of beautiful females, who are called by the name of an ancient beauty who once visited that planet; but how they live, and what they do, is not a matter of knowledge or of common fame. To the question, 'Is the moon inhabited?' discussed by some Western philosophers, the Chinese would answer in the affirmative. Several species of trees and flowers are supposed to flourish in the moon. Some say that, one night in ancient times, one of the three souls of the originator of theatrical plays rambled away to the moon and paid a visit to the Lunar Palace. He found it filled with Lunarians engaged in theatrical performances. He is said to have remembered the manner of conducting fashionable theatres in the moon, and to have imitated them after his return to this earth. About the time of the festival of the middle of autumn, the bake shops provide an immense amount and variety of cakes: many of them are circular, in imitation of the shape of the moon at that time, and are from six to twelve inches in diameter. Some are in the form of a pagoda, or of a horse and rider,

or of a fish, or other animals which please and cause the cake to be readily sold. Some of these 'moon-cakes' have a white rabbit, engaged with his pounder, painted on one side, together with a lunar beauty, and some trees or shrubs; on others are painted gods or goddesses, animals, flowers, or persons, according to fancy." [179]

If we turn now to Jeremiah vii. 18, and read there, "The women knead dough, to make cakes to the Queen of Heaven, and to pour out drink offerings unto other gods," and remember that, according to Rashi, these cakes of the Hebrews had the image of the god or goddess stamped upon them, we are in view of a fact of much interest. We are so unaccustomed to think that our peasants in Lancashire can have anything in common with the Chinese five thousand miles away, and with the Jews of two thousand five hundred years ago, that to many these moon-cakes will give a genuine surprise. But this is not all. Other analogies appear between Buddhist and Christian rites, such as those mentioned by Dr. Medhurst. "The very titles of their intercessors, such as 'goddess of mercy,' 'holy mother,' 'queen of heaven,' with the image of a virgin, having a child in her arms, holding a cross, are all such striking coincidences, that the Catholic missionaries were greatly stumbled at the resemblance between the Chinese worship and their own, when they came over to convert the natives to Christianity." [180] It is for the philosophical historian to show, if possible, whether these Chinese ceremonies are copies of Christian or Hebrew originals; or whether, many of our own Western forms with others of Oriental character, are not transcripts of primitive faiths now well-nigh forgotten in both East and West. The hot cross buns of Good Friday, at first sight, have little relevancy to moon worship, and those who eat them suppose they were originated to commemorate the Christian Sacrifice; but we know that the cross was a sacred symbol with the earliest Egyptians, for it is carved upon their imperishable records; we know too that bun itself is ancient Greek, and that Winckelmann relates the discovery at Herculaneum of two perfect buns, each marked with a cross: while the boun described by Hesychius was a cake with a representation of two horns. Incredible as it may seem to some, the cross bun in its origin had nothing to do with an event with which it is in England identified; it probably commemorates the worship of the moon. In passing from China, we may also note the influence of that sexuality of which we have spoken before. Dr. Medhurst remarks: "The principle of the Chinese cosmogony seems to be founded on a sexual system of the universe." [181]

Dr. Prichard tells us that among the Japanese "sacred festivals are held at certain seasons of the year and at changes of the moon." Also, "It appears that Sin-too, or original Japanese religion, is merely a form of the worship of material objects, common to all the nations of Northern Asia, which, among the more civilized tribes, assumes the aspect of mythology." [182]

From Asia we come to Africa, and to Egypt, that wonderful land with a lithographed history at least five thousand years old; a land that basked in the sunshine of civilization and culture when nearly the whole world without was in shadow and gloom. The mighty pyramid of Gizeh still stands, a monument of former national greatness, and a marvel to the admirer of sublimity in design and perfection in execution. "The setting of the sides to the cardinal points is so exact as to prove that the Egyptians were excellent observers of the elementary facts of astronomy." [183] But they went farther. Diodorus says: "The first generation of men in Egypt, contemplating the beauty of the superior world, and admiring with astonishment the frame and order of the universe, judged that there were two chief gods that were eternal, that is to say, the sun and the moon, the first of which they called _Osiris_, and the other _Isis_." [184] This passage is proof that the Greeks and Romans had a very limited acquaintance with Egyptian mythology; for the historian was indubitably in error in supposing Osiris and Isis to be sun and moon. But he was right in calling the sun and moon the first gods of the Egyptians. Rawlinson says: "The Egyptians had two moon-gods, Khons or Khonsu, and Tet or Thoth." [185] Dr. Birch has translated an inscription relating to Thoth, which reads: "All eyes are open on thee, and all men worship thee as a god." [186] And M. Renouf says: "The Egyptian god Tehuti is known to the readers of Plato under the name of Thoyth. He represents the moon, which he wears upon his head, either as crescent or as full disk." [187] The same learned Egyptologist tells us that Khonsu or Chonsu was one of the triad of Theban gods, and was the moon one of his attributes being the reckoner of time. [188] Of the former divinity, Rawlinson relates an instructive myth. "According to one legend Thoth once wrote a wonderful book, full of wisdom and science, containing in it everything relating to the fowls of the air, the fishes of the sea, and the four-footed beasts of the mountains. The man who knew a single page of the work could charm the heaven, the earth, the great abyss, the mountains and the seas. This marvellous composition he inclosed in a box of gold, which he placed within a box of silver; the box of silver within a box of ivory and ebony, and that again within a box of bronze; the box of bronze within a box of brass; and the box of brass within a box of iron; and the book, thus guarded, he threw into the Nile at Coptos. The fact became known, and the book was searched for and found. It gave its possessor vast knowledge and magical power, but it always brought on him misfortune. What became of it ultimately does not appear in the manuscript from which this account is taken; but the moral of the story seems to be the common one, that unlawful knowledge is punished by all kinds of calamity." [189] There is also a story of the moon-god Chonsu, which is worthy of repetition. Its original is in the _Bibliothèque Nationale_ at Paris, and for its first translation we are indebted to Dr. Birch, of the British Museum. [190] A certain Asiatic princess of Bechten, wherever that was, was possessed by a spirit. Being

connected, through her sister's marriage, with the court of Egypt, on her falling ill, an Egyptian practitioner was summoned to her aid. He declared that she had a demon, with which he himself was unable to cope. Thereupon the image of the moon-god Chonsu was despatched in his mystic ark, for the purpose of exorcising the spirit and delivering the princess. The demon at once yielded to the divine influence; and the king of Bechten was so delighted that he kept the image in his possession for upwards of three years. In consequence of an alarming dream he then sent him back to Egypt with presents of great value. Whatever evil powers the moon may have exerted since, we must credit him with having once ejected an evil spirit and prolonged a royal life.

Returning to Thoth, we find the following valuable hints in the great work of Baron Bunsen:--"The connection between Tet and the moon may allude, according to Wilkinson, to the primitive use of a lunar year. The ancients had already remarked that the moon in Egyptian was masculine, not feminine, as the Greeks and Romans generally made it. Still we have no right to suppose a particular moon-god, separate from Thoth. We meet with a deity called after the moon (Aah) either as a mere personification, or as Thoth, in whom the agency of the moon and nature become a living principle. We find him so represented in the tombs of the Ramesseum, opposite to Phre; a similar representation in Dendyra is probably symbolical. According to Champollion he is often seen in the train of Ammon, and then he is Thoth. He makes him green, with the four sceptres and cup of Ptah, by the side of which, however, is a sort of Horus curl, the infantine lock, as child or son. In the inscriptions there is usually only the crescent, but on one occasion the sign _nuter_ (god) is added. In the tombs a moon-god is represented sitting on a bark, and holding the sceptre of benign power, to whom two Cynocephali are doing homage, followed by the Crescent and Nuter god. Lastly, the same god is found in a standing posture, worshipped by two souls and two Cynocephali." [191]

With these "dog-headed" worshippers of the moon may be associated another animal that from an early date has been connected with the luminaries of the day and night. We saw that the Australian moon-myth of Mityan was of a native cat. Renouf says: "It is not improbable that the cat, in Egyptian _mäu_, became the symbol of the Sun-god, or Day, because the word mäu also means light." [192] Charles James Fox, with no thought of Egyptian, told the Prince of Wales that "cats always prefer the sunshine." The native land of this domestic pet, or nuisance, is certainly Persia, and some etymologists assign _pers_ as the origin of _puss_. Be this as it may, the pupil of a cat's eye is singularly changeable, dilating from the narrow line in the day-time to the luminous orb in the dark. On this account the cat is likened to the moon. But in Egypt feline eyes shine with supernatural lustre. Mr. Hyde Clarke tells us that "the mummies of cats, which Herodotus saw at Bubastis, attested

then, as they do now, to the dedication of the cat to Pasht, the moon, and the veneration of the Egyptians for this animal. The cat must have been known to man, and have been named at least as early as the origin of language. The superstition of its connection with the moon is also of pre-historic date, and not invented by the Egyptians. According to Plutarch, a cat placed in a lustrum denoted the moon, illustrating the mutual symbology. He supposes that this is because the pupils of a cat's eyes dilate and decrease with the moon. The reason most probably depends, as before intimated, on another phenomenon of periodicity corresponding to the month. Dr. Rae has, however, called my attention to another possible cause of the association, which is the fact that the cat's eyes glisten at night or in the dark. It is to be observed that the name of the sun in the Malayan and North American languages is the day-eye, or sky-eye, and that of the moon the night-eye." [193] Our own daisy, too, is the _day's eye_, resembling the sun, and opening its little pearly lashes when the spring wakes to newness of life.

The Nubians "pay adoration to the moon; and that their worship is performed with pleasure and satisfaction, is obvious every night that she shines. Coming out from the darkness of their huts, they say a few words upon seeing her brightness, and testify great joy, by motions of their feet and hands, at the first appearance of the new moon." [194] The Shangalla worship the moon, and think that "a star passing near the horns of the moon denotes the coming of an enemy." [195] In Western Africa moon-worship is very prevalent. Merolla says: "They that keep idols in their houses, every first day of the moon are obliged to anoint them with a sort of red wood powdered. At the appearance of every new moon, these people fall on their knees, or else cry out, standing and clapping their hands, 'So may I renew my life as thou art renewed.'" [196]

H. H. Johnston, Esq., F.Z.S., F.R.G.S., who had just returned from the region of the Congo, related the following curious incident before the Anthropological Institute, in January, 1884. It looks remarkably like a relic of ancient worship, which gave the fruit of the body for the sin of the soul, and committed murder on earth to awaken mercy in heaven! "At certain villages between Manyanga and Isangila there are curious eunuch dances to celebrate the new moon, in which a white cock is thrown up into the air alive, with clipped wings, and as it falls towards the ground it is caught and plucked by the eunuchs. I was told that originally this used to be a human sacrifice, and that a young boy or girl was thrown up into the air and torn to pieces by the eunuchs as he or she fell, but that of late years slaves had got scarce or manners milder, and a white cock was now substituted." [197]

The Mandingoes are more attracted to the varying moon than to the sun. "On the first appearance of the new moon, which they look upon to be newly created, the Pagan natives, as well as

Mahomedans, say a short prayer; and this seems to be the only visible adoration which the Kaffirs offer up to the Supreme Being." The purport of this prayer is "to return thanks to God for His kindness through the existence of the past moon, and to solicit a continuation of His favour during that of the new one." [198] Park writes on another page: "When the fast month was almost at an end, the Bushreens assembled at the Misura to watch for the appearance of the new moon; but the evening being rather cloudy, they were for some time disappointed, and a number of them had gone home with a resolution to fast another day, when on a sudden this delightful object showed her sharp horns from behind a cloud, and was welcomed with the clapping of hands, beating of drums, firing muskets, and other marks of rejoicing." [199] The Makololo and Bechuana custom of greeting the new moon is curious. "They watch most eagerly for the first glimpse of the new moon, and when they perceive the faint outline after the sun has set deep in the west, they utter a loud shout of 'Ku?!' and vociferate prayers to it." [200] The degraded Hottentots have not much improved since Bory de St. Vincent described them as "brutish, lazy, and stupid," and their worship of the moon is still demonstrative, as when Kolben wrote: "These dances and noises are religious honours and invocations to the moon. They call her Gounja. The Supreme they call Gounja-Gounja, or Gounja Ticquoa, the god of gods, and place him far above the moon. The moon, with them, is an inferior visible god --the subject and representation of the High and Invisible. They judge the moon to have the disposal of the weather, and invoke her for such as they want. They assemble for the celebration of her worship at full and change constantly. No inclemency of the weather prevents them. And their behaviour at those times is indeed very astonishing. They throw their bodies into a thousand different distortions, and make mouths and faces strangely ridiculous and horrid. Now they throw themselves flat on the ground, screaming out a strange, unintelligible jargon. Then jumping up on a sudden, and stamping like mad (insomuch that they make the ground shake), they direct, with open throats, the following expressions, among others, to the moon: 'I salute you; you are welcome. Grant us fodder for our cattle and milk in abundance.' These and other addresses to the moon they repeat over and over, accompanying them with dancing and clapping of hands. At the end of the dance they sing 'Ho! Ho! Ho! Ho!' many times over, with a variation of notes; which being accompanied with clapping of hands makes a very odd and a very merry entertainment to a stranger." [201] In reality they hold a primitive watch-night service; their welcome of the new moon being very similar to our popular welcome of the new year. Nor should it be omitted that the ancient Ethiopians worshipped the moon; and that those who lived above Meroë admitted the existence of eternal and incorruptible gods, among which the moon ranked as a chief divinity.

Descending the Nile and crossing the Mediterranean, we come to

Greece.

*"The isles of Greece, the isles of Greece
Where burning Sappho loved and sung,
Where grew the arts of war and peace,
Where Delos rose, and Phoebus sprung
Eternal summer gilds them yet,
But all, except their sun, is set." [202]*

Yes, Pericles and Plato, Sophocles and Pheidias, are dust; and much of their nation's pristine glory has "melted into the infinite azure of the past": but the sun shines as youthful yet as on that eventful day when unwearied he sank in ocean, "loth, and ere his time:

*"So the sun sank, and all the host had rest
From onset and the changeful chance of war." [203]*

Where Phoebus sprang, sprang Phoebe also--the bright and beautiful moon. To a people addicted to the idolatry of perfect form and comeliness, no object could be more attractive than the queen of the night. When Socrates was accused of innovating upon the Greek religion, and of ridiculing the Athenian deities, he replied on his trial, "You strange man, Melétus, are you seriously affirming that I do not think Helios and Selene to be gods, as the rest of mankind think?" [204] Pausanias, the historian, tells us that in Phocis there was a chapel consecrated to Isis, which of all the places erected by the Greeks to this Egyptian goddess was by far the most holy. It was not lawful for any one to approach this sacred edifice but those whom the goddess had invited by appearing to them for that purpose in a dream. [205] By Isis, as we saw from Diodorus, the Greeks understood the moon. Diana was also one of the Grecian moon-goddesses, but Sir George C. Lewis thinks that this was not till a comparatively late period. The religion of Greece was so mixed up, or made up, with mythology, that for an interpretation of their theogony we must resort to poetry and impersonation. Here again we see the working of sexual anthropomorphism. Ouranos espoused Ge, and their offspring was Kronos; which is but an ancient mode of saying that chronology is the measurement on earth of heavenly motion. Solar and lunar worship was but the recognition in the primitive consciousness of the superior worth-ship of these celestial bodies. As Grote says: "To us these now appear puerile, though pleasing fancies, but to our Homeric Greek they seemed perfectly natural and plausible. In his view, the description of the sun, as given in a modern astronomical treatise, would have appeared not merely absurd, but repulsive and impious." [206] What an amount of misunderstanding would be obviated if readers of the Bible would bear this in mind when they meet with erroneous conceptions in Hebrew cosmogony. Grote further says on the same page of his magnificent history: "Personifying fiction was blended by the Homeric Greeks with their conception of the physical

phenomena before them, not simply in the way of poetical ornament, but as a genuine portion of their everyday belief." We cannot better conclude our brief glance at ancient Greece than by quoting that splendid comparison from the bard of Chios, which Pope thought "the most beautiful night-piece that can be found in poetry." Pope's own version is fine, but, as a translation, Lord Derby's must be preferred:

*"As when in heaven, around the glittering moon
The stars shine bright amid the breathless air;
And every crag and every jutting peak
Stands boldly forth, and every forest glade
Even to the gates of heaven is opened wide
The boundless sky; shines each particular star
Distinct; joy fills the gazing shepherd's heart."* [207]

The Romans had many gods, superior and inferior. The former were the _celestial_ deities, twelve in number, among whom was Diana; and the _Dii Selecti_, numbering eight. Of these, one was Luna, the moon, daughter of Hyperion and sister of the Sun. [208] Livy speaks of "a temple of Luna, which is on the Aventine"; and Tacitus mentions, in his Annals, a temple consecrated to the moon. In Horace, Luna is "_siderum regina_"; [209] and in Apuleius, "_Regina coeli_," [210] Bishop Warburton, in his synopsis of Apuleius, speaks of the hopeless condition of _Lucius_, which obliged him to fly to heaven for relief. "The _moon_ is in full splendour; and the awful silence of the night inspires him with sentiments of religion." He then purifies himself, and so makes his prayer to the moon, invoking her by her several names, as the celestial _Venus_ and _Diana_. [211] This whole section of the _Divine Legation_ is worthy of close study.

"The ancient Goths," says Rudbeck ("Atalantis," ii. 609), "paid such regard to the moon, that some have thought that they worshipped her more than the sun." [212]

And of the ancient Germans Grimm says: "That to our remote ancestry the heavenly bodies, especially the sun and moon, were divine beings, will not admit of any doubt." [213] Gibbon, Friedrich Schlegel, and others, say the same.

The Finns worshipped "Kun, the male god of the moon, who corresponded exactly with the Aku, Enizuna, or Itu of the Accadians." [214]

In ancient Britain the moon occupied a high position in the religion of the Druids, who had superstitious rites at the lunar changes, and who are "always represented as having the crescent in their hands." [215] "From the _Penitential_ of Theodore, Archbishop of Canterbury, in the seventh century, and the _Confessional_ of

Ecgbert, Archbishop of York, in the early part of the eighth century, we may infer that homage was then offered to the sun and moon." [216] Again, "There are many proofs, direct and circumstantial, that place it beyond all doubt that the moon was one of the objects of heathen worship in Britain. But under what name the moon was invoked is not discoverable, unless it may have been Andraste, the goddess to whom the British queen Boadicea, with hands outstretched to heaven, appealed when about to engage in battle with the Romans." [217] A writer of the seventeenth century, says: "In Yorkshire, etc., northwards, some country woemen do-e worship the New Moon on their bare knees, kneeling upon an earthfast stone. And the people of Athol, in the High-lands in Scotland, doe worship the New Moon." [218] Camden writes of the Irish: "Whether or no they worship the moon, I know not; but, when they first see her after the change, they commonly bow the knee, and say the Lord's Prayer; and near the wane, address themselves to her with a loud voice, after this manner: 'Leave us as well as thou foundest us.'" [219] Sylvester O'Halloran, the Irish general and historian, speaking of "the correspondent customs of the Phoenicians and the Irish," adds: "Their deities were the same. They both adored Bel, or the sun, the Moon, and the stars. The house of Rimmon (2 Kings v. 18), which the Phoenicians worshipped in, like our temples of Fleachta, in Meath, was sacred to the moon. The word 'Rimmon' has by no means been understood by the different commentators; and yet by recurring to the Irish (a branch of the Phoenicians) it becomes very intelligible; for _Re_ is Irish for the moon, and _Muadh_ signifies an image; and the compound word _Reamham_ signifies prognosticating by the appearances of the moon. It appears by the life of our great St. Columba, that the Druid temples were _here_ decorated with figures of the sun, the moon, and the stars. The Phoenicians, under the name of Bel-Samen, adored the Supreme; and it is pretty remarkable that _to this very day_, to wish a friend every happiness this life can afford, we say in Irish, '_the blessings of Samen and Eel be with you_!' that is, of all the seasons; Bel signifying the sun, and Samhain the moon." [220] And again: "Next to the sun was the moon, which the Irish undoubtedly adored. Some remains of this worship may be traced, even at this day; as particularly borrowing, if they should not have it about them, a piece of silver on the first night of a new moon, as an omen of plenty during the month; and at the same time saying in Irish, 'As you have found us in peace and prosperity, so leave us in grace and mercy.'" [221] Tuathal, the prince to whom the estates (_circa_ A.D. 106) swore solemnly "by the sun, moon, and stars," to bear true allegiance, "in that portion of the imperial domain taken from Munster, erected a magnificent temple called Flachta, sacred to the fire of Samhain, and to the Samnothei, or priests of the moon. Here, on every eve of November, were the fires of Samhain lighted up, with great pomp and ceremony, the monarch, the Druids, and the chiefs of the kingdom attending; and from this holy fire, and no other, was every fire in the land first lit for the winter. It was

deemed an act of the highest impiety to kindle the winter fires from any other; and for this favour the head of every house paid a Scrubal, or threepence, tax, to the Arch-Druid of Samhain." [222] Another writer mentions another Irish moon-god. "The next heathen divinity which I would bring under notice is St. Luan, _alias_ Molua, _alias_ Euan, _alias_ Lugidus, _alias_ Lugad, and Moling, etc. The foundations, with which this saint under some of his _aliases_ is connected, extend over eight counties in the provinces of Ulster, Leinster, and Munster. Luan is to this; day the common Irish word for the moon. We read that there were fifteen saints of the name of Lugadius; and as Lugidus was one of Luan's _aliases_, I have set them all down as representing the moon in the several places where that planet was worshipped as the symbol of Female nature." [223] We have already seen that the moon was the embodiment of the female principle in China, and now we see that the primitive Kelts associated sexuality with astronomy and religion. It but further proves that "one touch of nature makes the whole world kin."

Moreover, to show that former moon-worship still colours our religion, it is not to be overlooked that, as our Christmas festivities are but a continuation of the Roman saturnalia, with their interchanges of visits and presents, so "the Church, celebrating in August the festival of the harvest moon, celebrates at the same time the feast of the Assumption and of the Sacred Heart of the Virgin. And Catholic painters, following the description in the Apocalypse, fondly depict her as 'clothed with the sun, and having the moon under her feet,' and both as overriding the dragon. Even the triumph of Easter is not celebrated until, by attaining its full, the moon accords its aid and sanction. Is it not interesting thus to discover the true note of Catholicism in the most ancient paganisms, and to find that the moon, which for us is incarnate in the blessed Virgin Mary, was for the Syrians and Greeks respectively personified in the virgin Ashtoreth, the queen of heaven, and Diana, or Phoebe, the feminine of Phoebus?" [224]

A recent contributor to one of our valuable serials writes: "I take the following extract from a little book published under the auspices of Dr. Barnardo. It is the 'truthful narrative' of a little sweep-girl picked up in the streets of some place near Brighton, and 'admitted into Dr. Barnardo's Village Home.' 'She had apparently no knowledge of God or sense of His presence. The only thing she had any reverence for was the moon. On one occasion, when the children were going to evening service, and a beautiful moon was shining, one of them pointed to it, exclaiming, 'Oh, mother! look, what a beautiful moon!' Little Mary caught hold of her hand, and cried, 'Yer mustn't point at the blessed moon like that; and yer mustn't talk about it!' Was it from constantly sleeping under hedges and in barns, and waking up and seeing that bright calm eye looking at her, that some sense of a mysterious Presence had come upon the child?" [225] To this query,

the answer we think should be negative. The cause more likely was that she had heard the common tradition which is yet current in East Lancashire, Cumberland, and elsewhere, that it is a sin to point at the moon. Certain old gentlemen, who ought to be better informed, still touch their hats, and devout young girls in the country districts still curtsy, to the new moon, as an act of worship.

The American races practise luniolatry very generally. The Dakotahs worship both sun and moon. The Delaware and Iroquois Indians sacrifice to these orbs, and it is most singular that "they sacrifice to a hare, because, according to report, the first ancestor of the Indian tribes had that name." But, although they receive in a dream as their tutelar spirits, the sun, moon, owl, buffalo, and so forth, "they positively deny that they pay any adoration to these subordinate good spirits, and affirm that they only worship the true God, through them." [226] This reminds us of some excellent remarks made by one whose intimate acquaintance with North American Indians entitled him to speak with authority. We have seen from Dr. Legge's writings that though the Chinese worshipped a multitude of celestial spirits, "yet the monotheism remained." Mr. Catlin will now assure us that though the American Indians adore the heavenly bodies, they recognise the Great Spirit who inhabits them all. These are his words: "I have heard it said by some very good men, and some who have even been preaching the Christian religion amongst them, that they have no religion--that all their zeal in their worship of the Great Spirit was but the foolish excess of ignorant superstition--that their humble devotions and supplications to the sun and the moon, where many of them suppose that the Great Spirit resides, were but the absurd rantings of idolatry. To such opinions as these I never yet gave answer, nor drew other instant inferences from them, than that, from the bottom of my heart, I pitied the persons who gave them." [227] Mr. Catlin undoubtedly was right, as the Apostle Paul was right, when he acknowledged that the Athenians worshipped the true God, albeit in ignorance. At the same time, though idolatry is in numberless instances nothing more than the use of media and mediators, in seeking the One, Invisible, Absolute Spirit, it is so naturally abused by sensuous beings who rest in the concrete, that no image worshipper is free from the propensity to worship the creature more than the Creator, and to forget the Essence in familiarity with the form. The perfection of worship, we conceive, is pure theism; but how few are capable of breathing in such a supersensuous air! Men must have their "means of grace," their visible symbols, their holy waters and consecrated wafers, their crucifixes and talismans, their silver shrines and golden calves. "These be thy gods, O Israel."

"The Ahts undoubtedly worship the sun and the moon, particularly the full moon, and the sun while ascending to the zenith. Like the Teutons, they regard the moon as the husband, and the sun as the wife; hence their prayers are more generally addressed to the moon,

as being the superior deity. The moon is the highest of all the objects of their worship; and they describe the moon--I quote the words of my Indian informant--as looking down upon the earth in answer to prayer, and as seeing everybody." [228] Of the Indians of Vancouver Island, another writer says: "The moon is among all the heavenly bodies the highest object of veneration. When working at the settlement at Alberni in gangs by moonlight, individuals have been observed to look up to the moon, blow a breath, and utter quickly the word, 'Teech! teech!' (health, or life). Life! life! this is the great prayer of these people's hearts." [229] "Among the Comanches of Texas, the sun, moon, and earth are the principal objects of worship." The Kaniagmioutes consider the moon and sun to be brother and sister. [230]

Meztli was the moon as deified by the Mexicans. In Teotihuacan, thirty miles north of the city of Mexico, is the site of an ancient city twenty miles in circumference. Near the centre of this spot stand the Pyramid of the Sun and the Pyramid of the Moon. The Pyramid of the Sun has a base 682 feet long and is 180 feet high (the Pyramid of Cheops is 728 feet at the base, and is 448 feet in height). The Pyramid of the Moon is rather less, and is due north of that of the Sun. [231] No doubt the philosophy of all pyramids would show that they embody the uplifting of the human soul towards the Heaven-Father of all.

In Northern Mexico still "the Ceris superstitiously celebrate the new moon." [232] This luniolatry the Abbé Brasseur de Bourbourg explains by a novel theory. He holds that the forefathers of American civilization lived in a certain Crescent land in the Atlantic that a physical catastrophe destroyed their country whereupon the remnant that was saved commemorated their lost land by adopting the moon as their god. [233] "The population of Central America," says the Vicomte de Bussierre, "although they had preserved the vague notion of a superior eternal God and Creator, known by the name Teotl, had an Olympus as numerous as that of the Greeks and the Romans. It would appear that the inhabitants of Anahuac joined to the idea of a supreme being the worship of the sun and the moon, offering them flowers, fruits, and the first fruits of their fields." [234] Dr. Reville bids us "note that the ancient Central-American cultus of the sun and moon, considered as the two supreme deities, was by no means renounced by the Aztecs." [235] Regarding this remarkable race, a writer in the *Quarterly Review* for April, 1883, says: "Even the Chaldaeans were not greater astrologers than the Aztecs, and we need no further proof that the heavenly bodies were closely and accurately observed, than we find in the fact that the true length of the tropical year had been ascertained long before scientific instruments were even thought of. Their religious festivals were regulated by the movements of these bodies; but with their knowledge was mingled so vast a mass of superstition, that it is difficult to discern a gleam of light through the thick darkness."

"The Botocudos of Brazil held the moon in high veneration, and attributed to her influence the chief phenomena in nature." [236] The Indian of the Coroados tribe in Brazil, "chained to the present, hardly ever raises his eyes to the starry firmament. Yet he is actuated by a certain awe of some constellations, as of everything that indicates a spiritual connection of things. His chief attention, however, is not directed to the sun, but to the moon; according to which he calculates time, and from which he is used to deduce good and evil." [237]

The celebrated Abipones honour with silver altars and adoration the moon, which they call the consort of the sun, and certain stars, which they term the handmaids of the moon: but their most singular idea is that the Pleiades represent their grandfather; and "as that constellation disappears at certain periods from the sky of South America, upon such occasions they suppose that their grandfather is sick, and are under a yearly apprehension that he is going to die; but as soon as those seven stars are again visible in the month of May, they welcome their grandfather, as if returned and restored from sickness, with joyful shouts, and the festive sound of pipes and trumpets, congratulating him on the recovery of his health." [238]

The Peruvians "acknowledge no other gods than the Pachacamac, who is the supreme, and the Sun, who is inferior to him, and the Moon, who is his sister and wife." [239] In the religion of the Incas the idol (huaco) of the Moon was in charge of women, and when it was brought from the house of the Sun, to be worshipped, it was carried on their shoulders, because they said "it was a woman, and the figure resembled one." [240]_Pachacamac_, the great deity mentioned above, signifies "earth-animator."

Prescott, in describing the temple of the Sun, at Cuzco in Peru, tells us that "adjoining the principal structure were several chapels of smaller dimensions. One of them was consecrated to the Moon, the deity held next in reverence, as the mother of the Incas. Her effigy was delineated in the same manner as that of the Sun, on a vast plate that nearly covered one side of the apartment. But this plate, as well as all the decorations of the building, was of silver, as suited to the pale, silvery light of the beautiful planet." [241]

In the far-off New Hebrides the Eramangans "worship the moon, having images in the form of the new and full moons, made of a kind of stone. They do not pray to these images, but cleave to them as their protecting gods." [242]

We have now circumnavigated the globe, touching at many points, within many degrees of latitude and longitude. But everywhere, among men of different literatures and languages, colours and creeds, we have discovered the worship of the moon. No nation has outgrown the practice, for it obtains among the polished as well as

the rude. One thing, indeed, we ought to have had impressed upon our minds with fresh force; namely, that we often draw the lines of demarcation too broad between those whom we are pleased to divide into the civilized and the savage. Israelite and heathen, Grecian and barbarian, Roman and pagan, enlightened and benighted, saintly and sinful, are fine distinctions from the Hebrew, Greek, Roman, enlightened, and saintly sides of the question; but they often reflect small credit upon the wisdom and generosity of their authors. The antipodal Eramangan who cleaves to his moon image for protection may be quite equal, both intellectually and morally, with the Anglo-Saxon who still wears his amulet to ward off disease, or nails up his horse-shoe, as Nelson did to the mast of the _Victory_, as a guarantee of good luck. Sir George Grey has written: "It must be borne in mind, that the native races, who believed in these traditions or superstitions, are in no way deficient in intellect, and in no respect incapable of receiving the truths of Christianity; on the contrary, they readily embrace its doctrines and submit to its rules; in our schools they stand a fair comparison with Europeans; and, when instructed in Christian truths, blush at their own former ignorance and superstitions, and look back with shame and loathing upon their previous state of wickedness and credulity."

=====

TRADE IN WOMEN

from Purchase of Women: The Great Economic Blunder

The Project Gutenberg eBook of *Essays in medical sociology, Volume I* (of 2), by Elizabeth Blackwell M.D.

It is necessary to define clearly the practical form of evil which is now under consideration, and to the effects of which the consciences of men and women must be roused. Ordinary immorality is not the demoralization of the slums--that horrible result of monopoly and speculation in land, where human beings are herded together like pigs--a condition into which the bargains of trade hardly enter. Neither is it the practice of free lust--a practice where unlimited liberty is claimed by both men and women to indulge the impulses of sexual caprice. Ordinary immorality is the distinct, deliberate application to women of the trading system of money values governed by unlimited competition. In this system activity, opportunity, and cleverness carry the day; conscientiousness and spiritual aspiration are out of place; innocence and ignorance constitute weakness, and, of course, go to the wall.

Ordinary immorality or fornication, assuming the female body to be an article of merchandise, necessarily subjects this merchandise to those fluctuations of the market, those variations in demand and supply, and that tyranny of capital over labour which destroy freedom of contract.

It may be urged that women 'consent' to be purchased, and that therefore there is a radical difference between the purchase of the bodies of men and women, which the anti-slavery movement has pronounced illegal, and the purchase of women by men which we are now considering. The sophistry of such evasion will be apparent if the question of 'consent' and the specious hypocrisy generally involved in freedom of contract be closely examined. Freedom of contract can only take place between those who in certain essential particulars are equals. The parties to any contract must be so far equals in intelligence, that they can equally understand any risks that may be run, and clearly foresee the probable results of the bargain; and they must be so far equals in social position, that neither party is compelled by the pressure of circumstances or the fear of want, to accept conditions which are unjust or unwise. No freedom of contract is possible where this degree of intellectual and practical equality does not exist. Freedom implies responsibility. There is no freedom if both parties are not free. Any insistence upon consent to a bargain ignorantly or forcibly made is fraud. It is fraud darkened by varying degrees of cruelty, proportioned to the superiority of intelligence and independence possessed by the stronger party in the bargain.

The grave error of excusing purchase by the plea of consent, is fully shown when the relations of capital to labour in the present system of competitive industry are understood. We are now so far removed from the primitive trade of barter, where values were determined by necessities, that first principles are commonly lost sight of. Generations have passed, during which ideas about wealth have become confused through complicated exchanges, stored-up labour inherited by those who no longer labour, violent seizures in the past or cunning ones in the present, with constantly changing standards or ideals. The quite new standard of converting everything into a money value, and measuring its value by money, has taken the place of older methods. As a result, money has become the autocrat of industry. Character, talent, activity still possess their uses, but only as the servants of money or capital, which have practically become interchangeable terms. The weaker portions of the human race are ever more and more deeply crushed down by the misery of a limitless competitive system, which is not based on the legitimate foundations of trust, freedom, and sympathy, and which consequently, by placing money as the irresponsible governor of the industrial world, makes the hypocrisy of so-called 'freedom of contract' the most bitter mockery.

It is necessary to realize the overwhelming and illegitimate power of money in the present day, if the condition of any grade is to be justly judged, and the responsibilities for the evils of a vicious trade rightly apportioned. In the terrible trade which converts the human body into a marketable commodity, it is no figure of speech, but a very weighty fact, that vicious men are the capitalists. The responsibility of that position must be recognised.

In judging either of the parties concerned in the trade, the question, 'Who are the capitalists or paymasters?' is the point to be insisted on. This is the fundamental fact to be steadily borne in mind--whether we consider the demoralized women who consent to the conversion of their bodies into merchandise; or the wholesale traders who organize to meet a demand increasing beyond the power of individuals to supply; or the State which connives at the trade; or society which condones it--the capital on which this nefarious traffic rests is supplied by licentious men. This is the great economic fact on which the whole system rests. All legislation and all benevolent effort that do not recognise this fundamental fact, will hopelessly wander in the labyrinth of evil trade, with no clue to direct their energies aright. From this unnatural employment of capital, two other economic evils directly arise--viz., first, the discouragement of honest industry; second, an unfair competition with male labour.

The discouragement of honest industry is a very serious economic evil. Any discouragement to patient industry, thrift, and self-control is direct encouragement to reckless improvidence, vicious indulgence, and the creation of a dangerously increasing predatory horde. Through obstacles to honest labour, our prisons are now filled with criminals, our streets with the vicious, and our work-houses with paupers. The industrious workers are taxed beyond endurance to support the institutions rendered necessary by the suicidal policy of degrading labour.

The discouraging difficulties which now surround all honest industry press with increased force upon women's labour, and compel a moral heroism to resist the special temptation which crowds upon them.

It is now a fact that in every large city, no woman with any pretension to natural attractiveness can fail to meet a purchaser. There are men who think it neither shame nor wrong to purchase for shillings or pounds, as the case may be, a temporary physical gratification, without reflection upon the inevitable results, individual and social, of their temporary action. The knowledge that money may be gained so easily, spreads from woman to woman. The contrast between the ease with which the wages of sin may be gained, and the laborious, even crushing methods of honest industry, becomes an ever present and burning temptation to working women.

It is undoubtedly true that the numerical excess of women in Great Britain, with other economic facts, intensifies most heavily upon woman the grinding pressure of our present industrial system. All rescue workers seeking to help their fallen sisters are constantly confronted with the appalling answer, 'Give me work; I cannot starve.' The awful extent of woman's industrial misery would now be more fully realized, had not well-meant benevolent efforts called in the harsh hand of the police to suppress begging, and thus crush it out of sight.

The increasing and perplexing flood of women in the streets, begging to be bought, is a strange commentary on the effect of the stern repression of begging for alms. If in the future, in addition to the suppression of ordinary begging by men and women, another edict goes forth forbidding women to present themselves for sale, but not forbidding men to purchase them, gross injustice to women will be added to a cruel abuse of power, and fresh impulse given to male vice. Certainly, if it were in the nature of women to become murderous criminals, any increasingly harsh and unjust attempts to crush their misery and degradation out of sight, would drive them into violent crime.

But it is not the seamstress slowly starving in her garret, nor the mass of struggling poverty that is alone, or even chiefly, beset by the fiery temptations of gain, and the enticing pleasures which money can provide. The deterioration of character, which is the gravest result of a false system of political economy, extends to much wider circles of society. This serious fact is sufficient to prove the error of those who look to the industrial independence of women, as the chief means of destroying licentiousness. Although freedom to obtain decent remunerative employment will secure an important condition for checking social evil, it will be a means only, it can never attain the end.

The great army of domestic servants, whether in public or private dwellings, are surrounded by constant temptations to supplement their wages or relieve their monotonous labour by selling themselves. When we remember the conditions under which the vast mass of servants have grown up, the exposures and privations of their homes, their undeveloped mental state in relation to social duties, the exhausting work upon which the majority of them enter in hotels, lodging-houses, struggling households, or the special danger of rich, careless establishments, and realize both the condition under which their service drags on and the natural instincts of the human being, then it is easy to understand why to a frightfully increasing extent they yield to the solicitations to which they are exposed. The five shillings secretly gained at night becomes an important addition to scanty wages, the stolen pleasures an intoxicating relief to drudgery. The economic effect of thus bringing the lightly-earned wages of vice into competition with the hard-earned wages of honest industry is to discredit the latter, and to produce discontent and careless, unwilling service in industries for which women are naturally better fitted than men; for the same state of things that is injuring domestic service, exists in dress-making, millinery, and all peculiarly feminine industries.

If we take the wider range of labour in which women compete more directly with men in the labour market, it will be found that this practice of purchasing women introduces an unfair element in

remuneration of labour. The introduction of the slave principle (the purchase of the human body) in cheapening women's labour, has a formidable effect in depressing the wages of working-men. In all systems of industry carried on by slaves the cost of maintenance is, as a rule, the limit of expenditure, the equivalent of wages. Also in the industrial systems of so-called free industry, the maintenance of the labourer again forms a limit beyond which profit cannot be extracted, for no man will consent to labour for less wages than will keep him alive. But this is not the case in regard to women's labour. As was proved a generation ago in France, and can be amply verified in other civilized countries, women's wages are forced down below subsistence point.

This important fact, with its cause, has evidently not been fully realized even by so close and impartial an observer as Mill. He says: 'The wages at least of single women must be equal to their support, but need not be more than equal to it; the minimum in their case is the pittance absolutely requisite for the sustenance of one human being. Now, the lowest point to which the most superabundant competition can permanently depress the wages of a man is always somewhat more than this. The _ne plus ultra_ of low wages can hardly occur in any occupation which the person employed has to live by, except the occupation of a woman.' Mill is evidently uncertain as to the causes of the under-payment of women in cases of equal efficiency with men, and is inclined to attribute it to injustice and to overcrowding in a few employments. He remarks: 'When the efficiency is equal but the pay unequal, the only explanation that can be given is custom, which, making almost every woman an appendage of some man, enables men to take the lion's share of whatever belongs to both.'

But in this generation, which has thrown open the broad gates of education to women, and which has enormously extended the range of employments into which they are invited to enter, the causes which Mill suggests (overcrowding, injustice, etc.) do not seem to give a sufficient economic reason. One powerful and growing cause of derangement in the natural rewards of labour has been overlooked--viz., the unequal competition with male labour which must result, when the wages given by vice are allowed to supplement the under-payment for honest work, and the street-door key makes up for the deficient salary. Whilst this phase of human slavery exists, and the female body remains an article of merchandise, the increasing competition with male labour will make itself more severely felt as wider fields of industry are extended to women and they develop increasing ability to enter them. The wages of women can never permanently rise to a just scale of labour value, until this slavish principle is eliminated, because this purchase introduces an uneconomical element into the remuneration of labour which destroys any legitimate effect of demand and supply. It enables competitive employers solely intent on profit to beat down the price of male as well as female labour indefinitely. Indeed, we have by no means reached the limits of this injustice. The practice of

purchase is still more dangerous in an economic point of view, because whilst the labour of all women tends to sink to the lowest point of remuneration, this lowest point can be reached in the labour of the young and strong, who are most eagerly sought for as merchandise.

The increasing employment of less remunerated female labour while male labour stands idle, is an alarming fact. The family is barely held together by the earnings, of a daughter, whilst father and brother lounge about the pot-house. The results of any sudden stoppage of a factory where large amounts of this cheap labour has been employed (as in the Barking jute factory, where 800 girls were suddenly thrown out of employment) is an object-lesson in the suicidal policy of degrading women.

The natural order of industry by which the man is the chief material support of the family, is disturbed and destroyed by this unnatural practice.

The purchase of young women adds cruelty to fraud. Youth must always fail to realize results which are only known through the experience of age. No amount of cautious or theoretic teaching given to the young can ever place them on an equality with the experienced adult. Moreover, it is Nature's law for youth that sexual attraction is quite out of proportion to intellectual development. The fact of this great natural law of slower mental growth is the Creator's imperative command laid upon the older generation, to protect and guide the youth of both sexes. The corruption of the young by the adult is not only fraud, it is dastardly cruelty.

Moreover, Nature has laid upon woman the more important share in the great work of continuing the race. It is not therefore pity, but justice which requires that reverent and grateful aid should be rendered by men, in the grand duty of creating an ever nobler race.

Trust, freedom, and sympathy form the bases of true relations between men and women, as they are also the moral foundations of political economy.

The depth of that sin against human nature--fornication or purchase--is seen in the results which follow from tempting women away from the paths of honest industry. These effects necessarily extend to the whole position and character of one-half the race, when any portion of women are turned into human merchandise. They are seen, by a careful study of those reckless or hardened ones who have become so direful a problem in all our large towns. How is that growing army of shameless women created who, with their companions, so fearfully avenge all social injustice on our boys and girls and our young men and maidens?

It is well known that there are thousands of 'fallen women' in London. What does this general statement in relation to women mean in detail?

What is involved in living by the sale of the human body? The woman, however 'fallen,' is still a human being with its desperate clinging to life. Let it be realized what is involved in thousands of women living to the age of three-score years and ten, who must feed themselves three times a day, and provide lodging, clothing, and the satisfaction of all human needs by the repeated sale of their bodies--thousands of women, with all the craving and ever active necessities of the human being, bodies and souls to be kept alive by the money of their buyers, and who are compelled to use every art of corruption to find the fresh purchasers through whom they have learned to live--women to whom lust and drink rapidly become a second nature, and sloth and falsehood habitual; women driven on by ceaseless material needs to lower and lower phases of misery and vice, in whom a bitterness is engendered that revenges itself on the weakness and innocence of youth, tempting the lad when the adult ceases to purchase; women who--terrible fact--finally losing their own marketable value, and scourged by their own daily recurring needs, throw away the last remnants of womanly instinct, and drag down young girls into their hell of life.

The grave fact must be borne in mind that each one of these thousands of marketable women--although once an innocent infant--now forms a centre of ever-widening corrupt influence in the varied relations of life. Each one, with father and mother, brothers and sisters, friends and acquaintances, servants and tradespeople, is exercising a fatal influence, desecrating the sanctity of sexual relations, proving the ease with which the rewards of vice are gained, bewildering the conscience of the innocent, and transmitting sensual tendencies to their descendants.

From these bought women come those enemies of social progress, who enslave our young men of the higher classes, our future statesmen, those who should be the leaders of the nation. From Skittles to Cora Pearl, our generation has witnessed the enslaving power of these tyrants of lust. They have dried up the generous enthusiasm of our youth, and destroyed those principles of trust, freedom, and sympathy which should guide our domestic and foreign policy.

Who is guilty of this appalling conversion of women into demons, this contagion of evil which in ever-widening circles is destroying our moral health, and injuring the modesty, freedom, and dignity of all womanhood? The immediate cause is the man, whether prince or peasant, who purchases a woman for the gratification of lust. It is this purchase which draws women into the clutches of a godless, money-making machine, which never loosens its hold of the feeble creature until the essential features of womanhood are crushed out of recognition. The irresponsible polyandry of prostitution, with its logical acceptance and regulation of brothels, has replaced in the West the polygamy of the East. In both, degradation, discouragement of marriage, and injustice to women create a fatal barrier to permanent national progress. But there is a more insidious source of evil than the direct

purchaser. The conversion of women into merchandise, whilst it produces a dangerous deterioration of female character, unavoidably reacts upon male character. This evil tends in women to produce the vices of the slave--deceit, falsehood, and servility; in men it tends to foster the vices of the slave-holder--arrogance, selfishness, and cruelty. In both it engenders that deadly sin--hypocrisy.

Hypocrisy is the vice which, above all others, our Lord denounces with the most awful condemnation, raising the drunkard and the harlot, with His far-seeing, merciful purity, and thrusting the Scribe and Pharisee--secret fornicators--into their place. 'He that is without sin, let him cast the first stone.' Hypocrisy is the vice which distinguishes in the most marked degree those nations which dare to call themselves Christian, but who practically deny every principle of Christ's teaching in the conduct of public and, to a great extent, private affairs. It is under this reign of hypocrisy that a more dangerous condition of sexual evil has grown up amongst us than has ever existed amongst heathen nations. When a savage tribe enslaves its enemies and trades in human flesh it does not trade against its conscience. In its rudimentary condition of slow emergence from brutish ignorance it knows no higher standard than a savage display of muscular force. When a polygamous nation buys both men and women, or endeavours to enforce the physical chastity of women by harem imprisonment, it obeys the highest authority it knows of, its religion, believed in, although erroneous in its teaching. The bitterest hatred and undying hostility felt by Mohammedan as well as savage communities to their Western invaders is due to the violation of their women, and the treatment of those women according to the hypocritical customs of their lustful conquerors. However false the standard of the savage or semi-barbarous peoples may be, they possess one, and strive to realize it. But the corruption which the latest and intensest phase of competitive money values has introduced into the most enlightened nations, is unexampled in the history of the race. The deliberate reasoning out and justification of the conversion of women into things is the abuse of our highest faculties, our power of reason and conscience.

The cruel vice of fornication, protected by hypocrisy, is sowing moral scrofula broadcast, and, like an insidious poison, producing generations of feeble, rickety wills and maniacal monsters. It is the degeneracy of the race. The palliation of this vice is shaking the foundation of our civilization, by destroying the moral basis on which alone progressive society can rest. The purchaser of a woman is directly guilty, but a deeper source of evil influence is the man or the woman who excuses and sanctions the purchase of women, by upholding a double standard of morality for the sexes. In the present age, while the actively licentious are following evil customs like sheep, some of their intellectual and spiritual leaders are throwing a veil of hypocrisy over these customs. The God-given faculties for creating literature, investigating science, and promoting religion are

being perverted to the justification or palliation of lust.

Our brothers have hitherto been the rough and active pioneers of human progress, first moulding the material framework of society, then becoming its leaders and teachers--teachers of those fundamental moral relations on which human society rests.

But a time has come in the development of the race, when much of the teaching and judgment formed by one-half the race alone, is seen to be liable to error, and requires to be weighed and approved by the other half of mankind.

The women half is necessarily slower in development, from being appointed to bear that great altruistic burden, maternity. But the very shackles or sufferings thus undergone for the sake of the race tend gradually to produce in women special adaptations to the higher spiritual ends of creation.

When we now inquire into and weigh the value of the teachings offered to women as the guide of their human relationship to men, we are struck with its amazing contradictions. All classes and sections bring forth their varying opinions. The scientist and the theologian, the physician, the lawyer and the journalist, the literary and the business man, the official and the man of leisure, are all seen carrying their load of heterogeneous materials to help build up the Babel of advice to women. All assert their knowledge of 'Nature and Instinct,' of 'Science and History,' or 'the tragical plea of material necessity,' to justify opinions founded on misunderstood data. But the sectional opinions of a portion of the race must necessarily be either imperfect, arrogant, or sentimental, and God confounds the Tower which foolish mortals strive to raise to heaven. All those, both men and women, who retain their reverence for sex, turn away from this unseemly Babel of conceit and short-sightedness, and ponder these things in hearts earnestly seeking truth.

The great question now at issue is the Unity of the Moral Law. This unity is being attacked by the intellectual short-sightedness or unconscious intellectual dishonesty of those who should be its most enlightened upholders.

One of our leading family journals has lately stated that 'the modern notion of equality impairs the responsibility of special classes for special virtues.' There is a sense in which special classes may be said to hold special responsibility. Women who are so vitally affected by the relations of the sexes are especially called on to strengthen and guide the sexual virtue of a people. They must consider the conditions essential to such virtue, and when they clearly see the truth, an army of noble men will zealously help in shaping truth in practice. The great truth which women are now learning is the necessity that every man should be chaste. This is the truth so long unrecognised, but at

last discovered as the solution of the great social problem. Without male chastity, female chastity is impossible.

Virtue is not self-righteousness. It is unconscious of self, because it has become a mode of individual existence, and it maintains its vitality by care for others. A chaste woman does not think of her own purity; she thinks of the poor girl drudging in cellars, or hurrying at night, waylaid by tempters, to her poor home, or 'drilled' in the rich man's shop; she thinks of her cherished sons with their noble and innocent young manhood exposed to the influence of the corrupt adult. Women's responsibility for the purity of society commands her to announce the conditions of purity, and unmask with a relentless justice--which is now the truest mercy--those destroyers of national purity, the upholders of a double standard of sexual morality. The fact that so many cultivated intellects resort to fallacy or metaphysical abstraction to palliate the destructive abuse of our sexual powers, is a direct call on women to help in spreading truth.

There cannot be one moral law for human beings, which is at the same time of unequal application to them. Moral law is not the creation of mediæval art, which, substituting a symbol for entity, represents the Great Creator as an aged man with long gray beard seated upon clouds. The moral law is not the arbitrary dictum of a man. The authority of the moral law springs from its adaptation by the Creator, to the nature of the beings subjected to it. It is the guide to the highest end of that nature, the necessary method by which its welfare is secured. Its authority is absolute, not relative, because it is the method of highest growth. Divine law admits of no exception, it cannot contradict itself. It is equally binding on the weakest as on the strongest, on the man as on the woman, or it is not law. If men are so constituted that they can grow to the full stature of manhood without obedience to the law of purity, then the moral law of purity does not exist for them, because it is not a necessary method of growth to their highest human development; their nature is not adapted by the Creator to the moral law; its influence over them is thus weakened, its absolute authority destroyed.

To profess to accept the unity of the moral law, but at the same time seek to avoid its consequences, is hypocrisy. The moral law cannot be evaded by any metaphysical creation of 'noble moral paradoxes.' [15] Any attempt to define purity as unequally binding on the sexes by being 'more for women, but not less for men,' is worse than nonsense, it is dangerous sophistry. It is a confusion of right and wrong, placing men and women on diverging paths which will lead them ever farther apart. It is a strange spectacle, the nineteenth-century Adam cowering under the overpowering justice of the moral law, seeking refuge behind a paradox! But the weak and erring children of one Great Creator, bound to live together and help or injure one another, must not be turned away from each other by the arrogance or ignorance of any portion of the race. What mortal can determine the varying kind and quality of

temptations which assail another mortal life? Who shall dare to say to another, You are not tempted as I am? Who can measure the weakness or the strength of another soul, and measure out judgment by shifting standards of right and wrong? Only by humility can we gain wisdom. Only by doing the will of the Creator shall we learn the doctrine of truth.

FOOTNOTES:

[14] 'At a meeting of the British Association, held September 7, 1886, the eminent African explorer, Mr. Joseph Thompson, spoke boldly of the evil influence of Europeans in Africa, remarking that it has been terrible, and that for one negro influenced for good by missionaries there were a thousand who had been driven to deeper degradation. We supplied them still with an incredible quantity of gin, rum, gunpowder, and guns.'

[15] See the Spectator, July 31, 1886.